APPENDIX. 3.

John W. Burgon.

1834.

D5

AN

APPENDIX

TO THE

SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY

FOR THE

BELIEVERS

IN THE

SUPPOSITITIOUS SHAKSPEARE-PAPERS:

BEING

THE DOCUMENTS FOR THE OPINION

THAT

HUGH Mc AULEY BOYD

WROTE

JUNIUS'S LETTERS.

By GEORGE CHALMERS, F.R.S.S.A.

LONDON:
Printed by Luke Hansard, Great Turnstile, Lincoln's-Inn Fields,
FOR THOMAS EGERTON, WHITEHALL.

1800.

AN

APPENDIX

TO THE

SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY

FOR THE

BELIEVERS

IN THE

SUPPOSITITIOUS SPANISH LETTERS:

BEING

THE DOCUMENTS FOR THE OPINION

THAT

HUGH MAILEY BOYD

WROTE

JUNIUS'S LETTERS.

BY GEORGE CHALMERS, ESQ. F.A.

LONDON:

Printed by Luke Hansard, Great Turnstile, Lincoln's Inn Fields,

FOR THOMAS EGERTON, WHITEHALL.

1800.

THE ADVERTISEMENT.

My attention was drawn aſide, by accident, to the ſubject of this Appendix, from more agreeable ſtudies. When I was writing my *Poſtſcript* to the Author of *The Purſuits* of *Literature*, I was led, by his declaration, "that he would quote "*Junius* as an *Engliſh claſſic*, like *Livy* or *Tacitus*," to advert both to the *political writer*, who was, in this manner, celebrated by factiouſneſs; and to his ſtyle, which was, thus, praiſed by ignorance. I was ſoon induced, by my conviction, to ſay, that I had ſeen documents, which ſatisfied me, that Hugh M'Auley was the real author of Junius's epiſtles. As ſome of theſe documents had been freely communicated to me by Mr. L. D. CAMPBELL, the Editor of *The Indian Obſerver*, delicacy forbade me to anticipate what he intended to publiſh, on the ſame point: But, he has blunted my ſenſations of delicacy, on this head, by attacking me, in the news-papers, on a *mere difference of taſte*. I now feel myſelf, therefore, at liberty to obey the calls, that have been made on me, to ſubmit to the judgements of others the ſame documents, which had brought conviction to my mind. In doing this, I have no other intereſt, than to prove, that I ſpoke not of documents, which I did not poſſeſs, and have no other purpoſe, than to ſhow, that I ſeldom deliver opinions, which I cannot ſupport by argument, and fact.

I do not regret, that a literary conteſt has ariſen, from my intimations upon a ſubject, not a little curious in itſelf, although the overflowings of the gall, which were excited by it, have ſoiled the outſide of my habit. I have looked on upon the com-

bat, without entering the lists; in order to see, more clearly, the peculiar artifices of the combatants, and the real objects of the battle. The Public has gained some advantages: additional facts have been ascertained; new circumstances have been disclosed; and appropriate inferences have been drawn, which, in the course of research, will lead to the establishment of truth. Interest may, indeed, perplex for a while, and scepticism may delude; but time will produce such knowledge, as will, in the end, fix all opinions in one judgement.

Before the publication of my *Supplemental Apology*, Mathias filled the news-papers, and the literary journals, with inquiries about the author of *his Pursuits of Literature:* he now fills both, with questions about the writer of *Junius*; thereby imitating the instinctive policy of the lapwing, which may deceive children, but not men. Personal lampoon, and artificial mystery, gave a temporary currency to the first of those libels, and have given it to the last: I will venture to foretel, that the same moment the mask shall be torn from the face of *Junius*, he will be consigned to neglect; he will, thenceforth, be no more regarded, than is the Author of the Pursuits of Literature, who brought himself into notice by the same means; viz. by the prostitution of his talents, whatever they may be, and by gross abuse of the characters of others, however respectable. Of Junius, I will conclude, in Johnson's words: "He will soon be "more attentively examined, and what folly has taken for a "comet, that from its flaming hair shook pestilence and war, "inquiry will find to be only a meteor, which, having plunged "its followers in a bog, will leave us inquiring, why we re-"garded it?"

THE following sheets were printed some months ago; But, understanding that *the Works of Hugh Boyd* were soon to be published, I thought it prudent to wait their appearance; in

order to ſee, whether they contained any documents, that would either confute my reaſoning, or confirm my judgment. I have, however, found nothing in them, which has in the leaſt changed my opinions, with regard to the author of Junius, to the character of M'Auley Boyd, or to the conduct of the Editor of his works. He has, indeed, publiſhed what I have often quoted, as the *unpubliſhed letter* of Mr. Almon. He has republiſhed *the Whig* from Almon's *Political Anecdotes*, which I have alſo quoted. He has, moreover, publiſhed, as the productions of his author, ſeveral ſeditious Eſſays from the Newspapers. Yet, his reſearches did not enable him to publiſh what I have now publiſhed, the WILL of M'Auley's father: neither has he given a *fac ſimile* of the hand-writing of his author, which I have ſuperadded, though I have not inſiſted on the compariſon of writings, either feigned, or real, as a proof. From the inſpection of ſeveral letters of Boyd, and of his wife, I perceive, that *he* wrote moſt like a woman, and *ſhe* moſt like a man. The editor has, at the ſame time, ſuppreſſed what I have quoted from his OBSERVER, p. 346. N° L. as an important document, for ſhewing, at once, the *cloven foot* of *Junius*, and Boyd's real ſentiments on the French Revolution. What other *ſuppreſſions* or *interpolations*, there may be in *Boyd's Works*, I have neither opportunity, nor leiſure, nor inclination, to develope.

I ſee that the editor of Boyd's Works is ſtill angry with me; becauſe I think differently from him about his favourite author, although I have laboured, with full as much diligence as himſelf, aud perhaps with full as much ſucceſs, in proving his fundamental propoſition, that M'Auley Boyd was the real author of Junius's Letters: And, he continues to harp, with recriminating quill, on my figurative expreſſion, that M'Auley Boyd was an *United Iriſhman*. We only differ in *taſte*, as I have already intimated: We agree, in aſſerting, that M'Auley Boyd wrote *Junius*'s Epiſtles, the *Antrim Freeholder*, *the Whig*, and *the Obſerver*; but, *his taſte* induces him to conſider thoſe publications, as very temperate, loyal, and meritorious, effuſions of a good ſubject; on the contrary, *my taſte* prompts me to infer from the

ſame

ſame premiſes, that the Antrim Letters are anarchical, that *the Whig* is ſeditious, and that Junius is turbulent, even to the very verge of treaſon: His taſte induces him to reject the judgements of our courts of juſtice, as to the matter of Junius; my taſte leads me to bow down to their authority, and to reprobate the writer, who was, thirty years ago, "diſowned, as a dangerous "auxiliary, by every party, in the kingdom." The editor's taſte induces him to regard the ſtyle of Junius as ſupremely excellent: my taſte prompts me to concur with Johnſon, who exploded it, with Gibbon, who did not admire it, with C. J. Fox, who ſpoke ſlightingly of it, and with Wilkes, who ſaw its defects. His taſte leads him to conſider the republication of ſeditious libels, as laudable: My taſte prompts me to regard the republication of libels, as libellous. The editor's taſte induces him to attempt the hard taſk of *waſhing the Blackamoor white*: My taſte leads me, as a biographer, to exhibit the ſubject, as he exhibited himſelf, by his actions, without endeavouring to whiten what cannot be made bright, or to blacken what cannot be made more unſeemly. But, about *taſte*, I have no purpoſe to diſpute either now, or hereafter, with the diſputatious, and taſteful, *editor of Boyd's Works*.

It is of far greater importance to ſtate, that the death of that excellent man, the Rev. Dr. Warton, now permits me to avow, that the anecdote in page 10, note (i), with regard to the firſt connection of W. G. Hamilton and Edmund Burke, I received from that admirable critic, who was *the proper judge of claſſical lore*, who recommended Burke to Hamilton; that the *reſpectable friend*, who is mentioned in page 16, note (q) was alſo Dr. Warton, who is again quoted in page 35, note (q) as my *intelligent friend*. I lament, that it is not in my power to avow, with equal diſtinctneſs, the other authorities, who gave me ſo much uſeful information; and who are equally reſpectable.

If there be any perſon, who is poſſeſt of facts, or documents, which would prove, affirmatively, that ſome other writer, than

M'Auley

THE ADVERTISEMENT.

M'Auley Boyd, was the author of Junius, such perſon ought to come forward, in his proper character, and lay before the public, without reſerve, ſuch facts, and documents: If he do not, the proofs and argument, which I now fairly ſubmit to the world, will, after awhile, convince all impartial readers, that M'Auley Boyd did certainly write *Junius's Letters.*

AN

APPENDIX

TO THE

SUPPLEMENTAL APOLOGY:

BEING

THE DOCUMENTS FOR

THE OPINION

THAT HUGH Mc AULAY BOYD WROTE

JUNIUS'S LETTERS.

DURING the progreſs of inquiry, and the inveſtigation of truth, it gave me ſatisfaction to obſerve, that the little, which I had ſaid, in my *Supplemental Apology*, about the writer of Junius, had produced ſome uſeful information, at the ſame time, that it gave riſe to a little controverſy: yet; in my mind, it deducts ſomewhat from the amount of ſuch gratification to obſerve, that new anecdotes about Spenſer, additional information about Shakſpeare, and curious documents about Milton, ſhould be leſs intereſting to *the Mob of Gentlemen, who write with eaſe*, than the detection of ſuch a ſcribbler as Mathias, or the expoſing of ſuch an anarchiſt as Mc Aulay.

What is, however, more diſtant will generally ſtrike with leſs force than what is more near. The diſpu-

tants felt little intereſt in Spenſer, Shakſpeare, and Milton, whatever they might feel, or pretend to feel, about Junius. They were apprehenſive, it ſeems, leſt an impoſition ſhould be practiſed on the public; and they were, therefore, diſpoſed rather to embrace error, with all her uglineſs, than to welcome truth with all her beauty. I oppoſed the quoting of Junius, as a claſſical authority; becauſe neither his ſtyle, nor his ſentiment, appeared to me to merit that diſtinction; whatever might be declared by ignorance, or conceived by Jacobiniſm. I have reviewed my opinion, as to who was the author of thoſe celebrated letters, and I ſee no reaſon to retract it: on the contrary, after reconſidering my documents, I am more fully convinced, notwithſtanding all that I have ſeen, and read, that Hugh M^c^Aulay Boyd was the real author of thoſe political papers, whatever may be the dignity of their manner, or the value of their matter.

I now preſume to give the reſult of my inquiries, with reſpect to a ſubject, which is ſurely harmleſs enough, if it be merely a queſtion, who wrote a ſeditious paper, thirty years ago, whatever any man may think of the *preſumption* of exerciſing, liberally, the private right of public diſcuſſion, on ſuch a ſubject.

I will proceed, briefly, to ſubmit my facts, and arguments, to all, who can find an intereſt, or feel a gratification, in the inquiry; who can read, without prejudice, and determine, without partiality. I will divide what I have to ſay into two heads: 1ſt. I will inquire, who did *not* write Junius's Epiſtles; and, 2dly, I will endeavour to ſhow, who did write thoſe Letters.

FIRST:

FIRST: It has been ſuppoſed, though I know not on what evidence of fact, or deductions of argument, that *Junius* was ſome great character; ſome man of great rank; ſome writer of great erudition; ſome lawyer of great knowledge; ſome politician of great importance. Yes: Every impoſtor pretends to vaſt conſequence, when he wiſhes to impoſe upon the world: *Paine* pretended to be a perſon of great importance, when he offered his jacobinical pamphlets to the Engliſh world: *Mathias*, when he wanted to circulate his jacobinical *Purſuits*, arrogated the privileges, belonging to a member of parliament of high rank, and to a ſcholar of vaſt learning. But, what are the pretenſions of Junius to greatneſs? As a man of quality, he condeſcended to write three years in the newſpapers [from the 21ſt of January 1769 to the 21ſt of January 1772]; to altercate with Mr. Horne; to correſpond with Mr. Wilkes; and to mingle in City politics with Bellas and Croſby, Sawbridge, and Townſhend. He was, plainly, *a man of the town*, who ran about the ſtreets, for three ſucceſſive years, collecting information, for the purpoſe of ſcribbling ſpeedy anſwers to petty objections. The improbability, that a man of quality would act thus, without any perceiveable motive, cannot be repelled by the conſideration "of the tone of equality, which he "ſeemed to uſe, in his expreſſions, reſpecting perſons "of rank." It might, by parity of reaſon, be ſaid, that he muſt have been a King; becauſe he had the audacity to write familiarly to *his* King. From recent experience, we know, that every anarchiſt writes of the greateſt perſonages, with perfect equality; becauſe

their purpoſe is to degrade greatneſs, by inſults on the high. Whoever undertakes to maintain an egregious improbability ought to bring with him into court the ſtrongeſt evidence.

He who contends for the *erudition* of Junius, would do well to produce examples of his profound literature, in order that his pretenſions may be ſcanned. When *erudition* is mentioned, we think of Bentley, or Bryant, of Buchanan, or Ruddiman; not of a pert templar, who is juſt come from College, with an high conceit of his own knowledge. It was the opinion of Wilkes, and his aſſociates, "that the writer of Junius was not "an author by profeſſion, from the viſible improve-"ments, which were, ſucceſſively, diſcernable in his "ſtyle *(a)*." Without knowing the opinions of others, it appeared diſtinctly to me, that the papers of Junius were produced by a juvenile writer, who had not formed his ſtyle, upon any model, nor by any rule. I am ſtill of this opinion, after reviewing the corrected Edition of his Epiſtles.

But, he was perhaps a great Juriſt. A Commentator upon *Coke-Littleton* avers, that Junius "was "not a profound Lawyer, from the groſs inaccuracy "of ſome of his legal expreſſions *(b)*." Junius, it ſeemeth, did not underſtand the *Termes del ley*. In that opinion I concur, from a conſideration of the abſurd reaſonings, and unconſtitutional doctrines of Junius.

Well: He was a writer of political importance. Yet, he did not acquire this importance from *inheri-*

(a) Anti-Jacobin Rev. July, 1799. P. 347.

(b) Id.

tance,

tance, but by *purchaſe*: He ſcribbled himſelf, and was ſcribbled by others, into importance. "Of "all the political writers," ſays Junius himſelf *(c)*, modeſtly, "that have diſtinguiſhed themſelves ſince "the acceſſion of the Houſe of Brunſwick to the "throne of Great Britain, the Author of Junius's "Letters is undoubtedly one of the moſt eminent. "Others have eſpouſed as noble a cauſe, and with "equal zeal, but few or none with equal abilities." In his *Letters to the Freeholders of Antrim, in* 1776, he claims to be conſidered as the greateſt conſtitutional writer: Locke, he allows, did much; but Junius did more. Theſe are, no doubt, very weighty reaſons, for acknowledging the great importance of this political writer. He was, however, a formidable antagoniſt to individuals, and a powerful opponent to government.

By this brief inveſtigation of the queſtion, who was *not* the Author of Junius, *in general*, we are led, by an eaſy progreſs, to the inquiry, who was *not*, in particular, the writer of that famous paper. And, thus, freeing ourſelves, by that inveſtigation, from prejudice, we ſhall proceed, in the inquiry, with more coolneſs; we ſhall liſten to facts, and circumſtances, with more attention; and ſhall judge with due impartiality, concerning this myſterious queſtion.

—LORD SACKVILLE—

Was one of the reſpectable perſonages, to whom the letters of Junius were early attributed, for the

(c) Anecdotes of the Author, prefixed to the 8vo. Ed. 1771, p. 1.

purpoſe of deception: But, thoſe, who wiſhed to conceal the truth, or to propagate the error, appear to have known little of the perſon accuſed, or of the ſcribbler concealed.

Lord George Sackville was the third ſon of Lionel, the firſt Duke of Dorſet, by Elizabeth, the daughter of Lieutenant General Colyear; and was born on the 26th of January 1715–16. He owed the firſt part of his ſcholaſtic education to Weſtminſter School, and the laſt part to Trinity College, Dublin: He wrote Latin verſes, while at Weſtminſter, on the acceſſion of George 2d; and he is ſaid to have, afterwards, done credit to his inſtructors at Dublin. He, however, choſe arms for his profeſſion. He received his firſt commiſſion in 1737; and he roſe, by one-and-twenty years of various, and diſtinguiſhed, ſervices, to be a Lieutenant General, a Privy Counſellor, and the Commander in Chief of the Britiſh forces in Germany. At the Battle of Minden, owing to ſome miſunderſtanding, which has not yet been clearly explained, he incurred the virtual cenſure of Prince Ferdinand of Brunſwick, the celebrated General of the allied troops, which, by drawing on him the indignation of the late King, occaſioned his diſmiſſion from the army.

At the commencement of a new reign, much is generally forgotten, and more is ſilently forgiven. On the acceſſion of his preſent Majeſty, Lord Sackville was received at Court with the grace, which Courts ſeldom deny to high birth, ſenatorial dignity, and conſiderable talents. For this courtly reception, however, was the government reviled, by the ſtudied acri-

mony of the North Briton *(d)*. From theſe intimations, it is apparent, that Lord Sackville had not received any unkindneſs from the King; and had not, conſequently, any temptation to mingle in City politics, on behalf of Wilkes, who had reviled him, with unprovoked illnature. Yet, was the writing of the Letters of Junius attributed to Lord Sackville, on I know not what pretence, except the mere ſuſpicion of Sir William Draper. At the age of fifty-three, Lord Sackville could not have any one motive to revile the King, to criminate the government, and to promote the intereſts of Wilkes, to whom he, certainly, owed no favours. The imputation of his being the writer of Junius's Epiſtles is, therefore, contrary to all the ſuggeſtions of common ſenſe, and is inconſiſtent with every rule of probability. Lord Sackville, when he heard, that the papers of Junius were imputed to him, voluntarily, diſavowed an imputation, which did no credit to his character. To a moſt reſpectable friend, a Fellow of the Royal Society, who then lived in habits of intimacy with him, his Lordſhip privately ſaid, what he probably deſigned ſhould be, publicly, repeated: "I ſhould be proud to be capable of "writing as Junius has done; but, there are many "paſſages, in his Letters, I ſhould be very ſorry to "have written."

Lord Sackville became Secretary of State in 1775; and afterwards a Peer of Parliament. He died, with the fortitude of a Soldier, and the reſignation of a Chriſtian, on the 26th of Auguſt 1785 *(e)*.

(d) N° 46.

(e) There is a full account of Lord Sackville, in the European Magazine, for September, and October, 1785.

—WILLIAM GERARD HAMILTON—

Has been ſuppoſed, with ſtill more confidence, to be the myſterious writer of Junius's letters. This gentleman was deſcended from the reſpectable family of Hamilton of Wiſhaw, in Ayrſhire, which family has lately ſucceeded, by deſcent, in a reſplendent line of anceſtors, to the Peerage of Belhaven. He was the ſon of William Hamilton, of Lincoln's Inn, by Helen Bruce, the ſiſter of David Bruce, of Kinaird, and the aunt to James Bruce, the celebrated traveller. William Hamilton left the Scotiſh, for the Engliſh, Bar, ſoon after the Union; and roſe, by his talents, and application, to great eminence in his profeſſion, and lived to acquire abundant wealth. He became a Bencher of the Society, the Treaſurer of Lincoln's Inn, in 1752, and he died, on the 15th of January, 1754.

William Gerard Hamilton was born, in Lincoln's Inn, on the 28th day of January 1728–9 *(f)*. He was educated under the Reverend Doctor Barton at Wincheſter, and he afterwards entered, as a Gentleman Commoner, in Oriel College, Oxford; where he aſſociated with men, who were eminent for birth, literature, and talents. In this learned Society, he

(f) "Lincoln's Inn: William Gerard Hamilton, ſon of William Hamilton, Eſq; and Helen his wife, was born January 28th, was baptized February 25th, 1728."

"The above is a true copy from the Regiſter of Baptiſms kept in Lincoln's Inn Chapel, made this 5th day of November 1799, by me William Walker, Chaplain."—This Certificate, by aſcertaining the fact, ſettles deciſively the differences of the literary journals, with regard to the age of William Gerard Hamilton.

diſtinguiſhed

diſtinguiſhed himſelf by the publication of two Engliſh Odes, which were admired, for ſtrength of ſentiment, and elegance of language. In this Society, however, he diſſipated both his health, and his fortune: His diſſipation entailed upon him a paralytic affection, which gave a colour to his whole life. Here too, he incurred debts to the amount of £. 4,000 ſterling, which his father generouſly paid; and this ſuggeſted to a man of his father's prudence, to entail his whole eſtate upon his ſon, for life, and upon his own brothers, in ſucceſſion.

William Gerard Hamilton, intending to follow his father's profeſſion, entered himſelf in Lincoln's Inn. But, his habits of diſſipation, his expectation of wealth, and his paſſion for politics, diſqualified him for the purſuit of the object, which had been rather taken up, naturally, from his father, than choſen by himſelf. Soon after the deceaſe of his father, he became a Member of the Houſe of Commons, as repreſentative for Petersfield. He continued on this great theatre, where he *once* diſtinguiſhed himſelf, and ought always to have ſhone, till the laſt year of his life *(g)*. It was Henry Fox, a noted ſtateſman of that age, who firſt diſcerned, in the youthful orator, talents for a popular aſſembly, though they flaſhed but for a night. This flaſh, however, gave him a ſeat at the Board of Trade, with Lord Halifax; where he

(g) In 1754, William Gerard Hamilton was choſen for Petersfield; in 1761, for Pontefract; in 1768, for Old Sarum; in 1774, for Wareham; in 1780, for Wilton; in 1784, for Wilton; in 1790, for Haſlemere: And he declined, at the election, in 1796. —[Parl. Reg.]

continued

continued to ſit, till his Lordſhip was appointed, in March 1761, the Lord Lieutenant of Ireland *(h)*.

When William Gerard Hamilton was entering into political life, he felt the inconvenience of having neglected ſtudy, during that period of youth, when ſtudy ought to be the only occupation. Thus feeling his defects, he naturally wiſhed for help: He became deſirous of the aſſiſtance of ſome perſon of ſuperior attainments, to read with him the Latin, and the Greek, Claſſicks: Edmund Burke was, accordingly, recommended to him, by a proper judge of claſſical lore, as a fit maſter to read with him, in a critical manner, the ancient authors *(i)*. Such was the commencement of the connection, between William Gerard Hamilton, and Edmund Burke, which, though it did not laſt long, was undoubtedly honourable to both parties.

When Lord Halifax was named Lord Lieutenant of Ireland, in March 1761, William Gerard Hamilton was appointed his Secretary, at the age of thirty-two. Edmund Burke, who was about the ſame age, was choſen for the Secretary of the Secretary. Lord Halifax opened the firſt Parliament of Ireland, during this reign, on the 11th of October 1761, with a ſpeech

(h) On the 24th of April 1756, William Gerard Hamilton was appointed a Commiſſioner for Trade; he was re-appointed, on the 11th December 1756; again on the 24th December 1759; and again in January 1760; but he was not appointed, on the 21ſt of March 1761, when Lord Sandys was placed at the head of the Board, in the room of Lord Halifax, who was declared Lord Lieutenant of Ireland.—[Court Reg.]

(i) I have been told this anecdote by two ſuch reſpectable authorities, as leave not the leaſt doubt about the fact.

of

of leſs elegance than might have been expected from ſuch a concurrence of talents. It was, in this parliament, that William Gerard Hamilton made ſome ſpeeches, which were ſufficient, at leaſt, to free him from the *ſobriquet*, which was improperly annexed to his name, It may be allowed, however, that he ſpoke, in that parliament, as cowards fight, when they are driven to the wall, by compulſion. The inability of William Gerard Hamilton, as a public ſpeaker, was not owing to a defect of talents, but to a want of nerves. At the end of the ſeſſion, Lord Halifax returned, with great parliamentary applauſe, to England, where he was placed at the head of the Admiralty, for a while; and was ſoon after appointed Secretary of State, in October 1762. His influence, in this ſituation, procured for William Gerard Hamilton, on the 30th of September, 1763, the reſpectable office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, in Ireland, for life, on the reſignation of Sir William Yorke, who was allowed a penſion of twelve hundred pounds. Such an office, with the rank of a Privy Counſellor, was a proviſion, quite equal to his pretenſions, amid the competitions of perſons, and the revolutions of parties.

The year 1765, as it is the epoch of a miniſterial change, alſo marks the period of the ſeparation of William G. Hamilton, and Edmund Burke, who both courted the ſame miſtreſs, but with different talents, and diſſimilar addreſs. Time, and chance, have not yet revealed the document, which contains the genuine terms of their final diſunion. As if to ſupply the void, which this rupture occaſioned, William G. Hamilton

Hamilton ſolicited the friendſhip of the late Doctor Johnſon, who appears to have entered with ardour into his views, whatever they were *(k)*.

The uſual irreſolution of Hamilton, probably obſtructed the original purpoſe of Johnſon. But, a friendly connection began, which was long continued by the generoſity of Hamilton, and the gratitude of Johnſon; who admired his converſation, which was only forced, and eſteemed his liberality, which was only offered *(l)*.

William G. Hamilton retained his office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, one-and-twenty years: And, when a new policy required, that the duty of the Chancellor of the Exchequer in Ireland, ſhould be diſcharged, as in England, in proper perſon, and with official reſponſibility, he reſigned it for an annual penſion of two thouſand pounds. In the mean time, William G. Hamilton was not idle: He intrigued much; he wrote much, though he publiſhed little; and he ſtudied moſt of the great queſtions, which came before the parliament, during an intereſting period, in order that he might have an opinion to give, without making a ſpeech. He died, on the 16th

(k) On the 26th of September 1765, Johnſon made a prayer on his "*engaging* in POLITICS with H——n." [Boſw. Life, vol. i. p. 454.]

(l) When Johnſon was confined, by a long indiſpoſition, in 1783, Hamilton offered him, by Dr. Brockleſby, money, which, as it was not wanted, was declined: This act of friendſhip induced, however, Johnſon to write Hamilton two admirable Letters, which are preſerved by Boſwell. [Ib. vol. iii. p. 501. 635.]

of

of July 1796 *(m)*; leaving by a ſhort will, with ſeveral codicils, his natural daughter, Charlotte Geddicot, reſiduary legatee. His books were ſold by auction; but, a very large collection of manuſcripts, which were chiefly of his own compoſing, was, cautiouſly, reſerved, for the inſtruction of poſterity.

Of this perſon, it has been ſtill more confidently ſaid, that he wrote the Epiſtles of Junius: For, "the "ſtory is, that ſingle-ſpeech Hamilton informed one "of his friends, that the Junius of the morning con- "tained ſuch and ſuch paſſages, and that till the "ſubſequent day no ſuch Junius made his appear- "ance:" Wilkes, and his aſſociates, thought this ſtory ſufficiently authenticated; but, they alſo thought it ſufficiently accounted for, by the ſuppoſition, that Woodfall had ſhewn the letter to Hamilton, on the preceding day, and mentioned his intention of inſerting it, but had been, unexpectedly, prevented *(n)*. Before we draw concluſions from ſuch a ſtory, all its circumſtances of limitation, and explanation, ought to be attended to. The unqualified propoſition, then, is, that a Privy Counſellor of Ireland, and the King's Chancellor of the Exchequer, in that kingdom, publiſhed letters, reviling the King's government, and

(m) Gent. Mag. p. 702, which ſtates his age, miſtakingly, at ſixty-nine, inſtead of ſixty-ſeven. He was buried in the chancel vault of the church of St. Martin in the Fields, Weſtminſter. His father bequeathed him, ſpecifically, a ſnuff-box, with a picture of Mary Queen of Scots, in the lid of it: What became of this ſnuff-box, which ought to have deſcended, as an heirloom, I could not learn: Perhaps, it was ſent to the broker's, with ſome ancient family pictures.

(n) See the letter of Mr. C. B. in the Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, 1799, p. 348.

reflecting

reflecting on the King's perſon. That a politician, whoſe great defect was *want of nerves*, publiſhed libels, which, to write, required the greateſt intrepidity, and, to publiſh, incurred uncommon riſque, is an improbability, which requires the ſtrongeſt proof. The propoſition ſuppoſes, that William Gerard Hamilton, at the age of forty, when men are ſeldom fools, with an ample proviſion, would act, like an adventurer of two-and-twenty, who had a fortune to make, or to retrieve; that he would continue, for years, to act, without a motive, offenſively to thoſe, who had not injured him, and riſque much, on the hope of little. The propoſition ſuppoſes, alſo, that he would revile the adminiſtration, whereof his friend Lord Halifax formed a part *(o)*; that his well known intimacy with Lord Mansfield did not prevent him from perſecuting that great Judge, with unrelenting malevolence. Moreover, the propoſition ſuppoſes, that William Gerard Hamilton would revile Doctor Johnſon, whoſe friendſhip he courted, becauſe he wanted his literary help *(p)*. Upon this general view of the propoſition,

(o) The firſt Letter of Junius is dated January 21ſt, 1769; the laſt on January 21ſt, 1772: Lord Halifax was made Privy Seal, on February 9th, 1770; and Secretary of State, January 22d, 1771; and he died, on the 12th June of the ſame year.

(p) Junius cenſured him in that coarſe language, which he uſed, at times, "An exceptionable paſſage in the conduct of "Junius [Edmund Burke] when he laviſhed panegyric, before a "great aſſembly, on the flagitious author of an infamous pam-"phlet, entitled, the FALSE ALARM; a pedantic pedagogue, who "after having ſpent half a century of his life in cultivating a "rooted antipathy to the family on the throne, and the moſt "rancorous abuſe of the Hanover ſucceſſion, had accepted of that "gratuitous

poſition, every probability forbids our belief of a ſtory, which, however confidently told, is very looſely ſupported. I will confirm this improbability by a proof, which wiſe men have deemed deciſive. I have been aſſured by perſons, who were intimately connected with William Gerard Hamilton, that when he drew towards his latter end, he ſaid to them: "That as "he ſuppoſed, there would be hereafter ſome in-"quiries made, about the writer of Junius, he would "aſſure them, that *he was not*; but that he knew, "who was the author of that paper." We thus ſee a man, who acted, myſteriouſly, all his life-time, dying with myſtery in his mouth, as there is, indeed, alſo myſtery in his will. I can eaſily credit him, when he

"gratuitous emolument from the Crown, which he had conſtantly "ſtigmatized as the wages of iniquity, and in his old age moſt "ſervilely proſtituted his pen, for that wretched hire he had ſo "long and loudly condemned. And yet, becauſe this formal pe-"dant could expatiate on trifles, ſwell inſignificance by amplifica-"tion, give verboſity to ſenſe, and pompoſity to ſound, he was de-"fended by Junius [Ed. Burke] as a paragon of integrity; as if "men of letters were privileged to betray their country, and the "ſuperior knowledge of what is right entitles men to do wrong. "[Pref. Anecdotes of Junius to his Edition of 1771.]" In this manner, muſt we ſuppoſe, William Gerard Hamilton to have written of Johnſon, whom he admired, and courted. The above quotation furniſhes a happy ſpecimen of the genuine *balderdaſh* of *Junius*, who expatiates on trifles, ſwells inſignificance by amplification, ſubſtitutes ſophiſtry for ſenſe, and verboſity for ſound: As ſoldiers cannot draw their ſwords in a nobler cauſe, than the ſupport of the laws; men of letters cannot uſe their pens more honourably, than by defending their couutry, when its eſtabliſhments are undermined by faction, and attacked by anarchy. Superior knowledge ought to underſtand, that it is but wretched logick, which ſuppoſes the point, that philoſophy ought to prove.

ſays,

ſays, that he was not the writer of Junius's Letters; becauſe I think he was incapable of writing them; but I do not believe, that he knew the author; becauſe the writer was too cunning to reveal his important ſecret; and William Gerard Hamilton, like other profeſſed politicians, always thought himſelf a ſkilful diver into the profound below the common current of life, although he ſwam on the mere ſurface of politics, as they glided along *(q)*.

—EDMUND BURKE.—

There are very intelligent perſons, who poſitively ſay, as they were not cured of their dogmatiſm by the ſceptical reaſonings of his biographers, that this uncommon man was the real author of Junius's Letters.

The Burkes of Ireland are deſcended, either directly, or collaterally, from the great de Burgh of feudal times. Edmund Burke was the ſon of John Burke, of the city of Dublin, gentleman. About the exact time of his birth there is ſome doubt. His biographer tells, that he was born, in the city of Dublin, on the 1ſt of January 1730: On the contrary, the Regiſter of Trinity College, which records the admiſ-

(q) A moſt reſpectable friend, who knew Hamilton from his youth, has written to me as follows: "Gerard Hamilton had "abilities ſufficient, and abilities of that ſort, as made it highly "probable he wrote *Junius*; but, at the time, we of his acquaint-"ance, all agreed, that he had not political courage enough; as "caution was a great feature in his character." Almon, who knew moſt of the political intrigues of thoſe ardent times, ſays that William Gerard Hamilton, who ſpent many an hour in his parlour, did not write Junius.

ſion

ſion of Edmund Burke into that celebrated ſeminary, counts his age at ſixteen, when he was admitted into it a penſioner, on the 14th of April 1743 *(r)*. He received the rudiments of learning at the ſchool of Balynore; he compleated his knowledge of letters at the univerſity of Dublin. From this eminent ſeat of learning he departed, probably, in 1748. A ſtory is told of Edmund Burke, that his firſt ambition conſiſted in a deſire to ſucceed his countryman Dr. Hutchinſon, as profeſſor of moral philoſophy, in the univerſity of Glaſgow. But, as Dr. Hutchinſon died, while Edmund Burke was, in years, only a boy, and in academic honours, only a ſcholar, this tale, which has been often told, cannot poſſibly be true *(s)*.

(r) The Beauties of Edmund Burke, p. iii:—" 1743, April " 14. Edmundus Burke, Penſ. filius Johannis, Gen. annum agens " 16, natus Dublinii, educatus ſub ferulâ M. Shakelton. Tut. D. " Pelliſier." Elected a Scholar of the Houſe 26th of May 1746; commenced A. B. the 23d of February 1747–8: But he does not appear to have been elected a *Native*, who is entitled to an annual ſtipend after a certain ſtanding. I follow the evidence of this Record, which is the beſt evidence, till the Record of his baptiſm is produced.

(s) Dr. Francis Hutchinſon died, at Dublin, on the 8th of Auguſt 1746. [Scots Mag. 398.] The Univerſity of Glaſgow, who have the right of nomination to this chair, elected, in the room of Dr. Hutchinſon, on the 1ſt of October 1746, Mr. Thomas Craigie, the Profeſſor of Hebrew in the Univerſity of St. Andrews. [Ib. 451.] In April 1752, the celebrated Dr. Adam Smith was elevated to this chair, on the deceaſe of Craigie. [Ib. 214.] At this epoch, indeed, the ſtory would apply to Edmund Burke. And, Dr. Smith was ſucceeded by the excellent Dr. Thomas Reid, on the 22d of May 1764. [Ib. 292.]

It is material to remark, that Edmund Burke firſt came forth, as a political writer, againſt the noted demagogue Doctor Lucas, in 1749: His youthful mind perceived the pernicious tendency of levelling doctrines; and his forward talents expoſed the dangerous conſequences of democratic innovations *(t)*. About the year 1752, Edmund Burke left Dublin, and Lucas, for the very diſſimilar ſcenes of London, and the Temple; and exchanged faction, and wrangling, for the law, and love: Which of the Temples had the honour to teach the Engliſh law to Edmund Burke we are not told; but it is certain, that he married, while he was yet a templar, Jane Mary Nugent, the accompliſhed daughter of Doctor Nugent, a woman, who, during the various fortunes of her huſband, ſhowed, by her conduct, that ſhe was worthy of the choice of ſuch a man.

We may eaſily ſuppoſe, that the law did not altogether engroſs the time and talents of Edmund Burke. He read, with attention, and ſcorn, the works of Lord Bolingbroke, which, when publiſhed by Malloch, were preſented by the grand jury of Weſtminſter, as a nuiſance. Burke now attacked Bolingbroke, as he had formerly attacked Lucas; from the ſame honourable motives: He abhorred the principles, and oppoſed the practices, of both, from a conviction of their dangerous tendency. In May 1756, he publiſhed, anonymouſly, his firſt pamphlet; "A Vindica-" tion of Natural Society; or a View of the Miſeries " ariſing to Mankind from every Species of Artificial

(t) The Life of Burke, p. 19.

" Society:

" Society: By a late noble Writer." Irony appears upon the face of the title page with a light ſufficiently ſtrong: Yet, the ſtyle, and ſophiſtry, of Bolingbroke, are ſo artfully imitated, that the critics were impoſed upon, as they uſually are, by putting on the ſpectacles of ſelf-ſufficiency. For the copy-right of this eighteen-penny pamphlet, which was publiſhed by Cooper, Edmund Burke was paid ſix guineas. I have heard it wittily remarked, that Burke received ſix pounds for ſowing the ſeeds of French principles, and a thouſand for ſpoiling the harveſt *(u)*: But, wit, and truth, ſeldom play their coruſcations long together, in the ſame atmoſphere!

We had now commenced our war with France about American boundaries. Every tongue talked, in 1756, about our American rights; and every pen ſcribbled about our checks by land, and our ſucceſſes by ſea: While curioſity was awake, and inquiry was active, Edmund Burke produced, in April 1757, " An " Account of the European Settlements in America." He was paid for the copy-right of this hiſtory, which was received with an univerſal welcome, fifty guineas. Of this work, he would never admit, that he was the author. Yet, ſuch are its comprehenſive brevity, and its elegant preciſion, that this book is not unworthy of the genius, and talents of Edmund Burke. I do not however ſay, but that a man of more elaboration than the author, with American Records at his hand, could detect in it many inaccuracies of aſſertion, and expoſe many deficiencies of policy.

(u) Edmund Burke received a thouſand pounds for the produce of his celebrated Reflections on the French Revolution.

It is curious to remark, that the taſte of Burke correſponded with the judgment of Hume, in hiſtoric writing: They both concurred in approving ſimplicity of ſtyle, and ſtrength of remark. Upon theſe principles, Edmund Burke engaged, at a ſubſequent day, in writing a hiſtory of England, which proceeded to the preſs; but it was ſuppreſſed, from a conſideration of the popular prevalence of Hume's hiſtory. It is eaſy to perceive, from an examination of his *European Settlements*, that Burke, in hiſtory, would have ſhewn, like Hume, great profundity of obſervation, and elegance of narrative; but with all, great want of elaboration.

Edmund Burke was too buſy, at that period of his life, for hiſtorical reſearch: But he produced ſoon after, "A philoſophical Inquiry into the Origin of our Ideas "of the Sublime and Beautiful." Of this elegant book, Johnſon remarked, "We have an example of "true criticiſm in Burke's Eſſay on the Sublime and "Beautiful." It was criticized by Murphy, with ſuch extent of obſervation, and ſuch vigour of ſtyle, as to have induced competent judges to attribute the criticiſm to Johnſon. For a little book, which was thus ſaid to have given an example of *true criticiſm*, Burke received from the bookſeller twenty guineas, from his father a hundred pounds, and from the public, laſting reputation, as a writer.

Invigorated by all thoſe motives, Edmund Burke ſoon engaged in a work, which will tranſmit his celebrity through as long a period, and with as laſting renown, as his Eſſay on the Sublime and Beautiful. In April 1758, he entered into an engagement, for a hundred

dred pounds a year, to compile the *Annual Regiſter*; comprehending *a view of the hiſtory, politics, and literature of the year*. On theſe three topicks, it is eaſy to trace, in the *Annual Regiſter*, the effuſions of the heart, and the ſketches of the hand of Burke, which gave an high colouring to the pages of this uſeful work, during every period of his fortunes. Much of the meaner matter, ſuch as ſtate-papers, projects, baptiſms, burials, and preferments, was, doubtleſs, ſupplied by inferior hands; by ſhopmen, and printers. Edmund Burke had now contrived ſome employment for himſelf; though perhaps not full occupation for a mind of ſuch vigour, and activity.

The time was at length come, when he was to engage in an employment of a very different ſort. His early connection with William Gerard Hamilton, naturally, led him out of the primroſe path of literature, into the thorny ways of politics. When Lord Halifax went to Ireland, as Lord Lieutenant, William Gerard Hamilton accompanied him as the Secretary, with Edmund Burke, for his private Secretary. At Dublin, Hamilton and Burke lived together, in the ſame houſe, as their connection ſuggeſted, and their buſineſs required. Lord Halifax's adminiſtration was ably conducted, and ended happily. Hamilton ſecured for himſelf the Office of Chancellor of the Exchequer, and for Burke, a penſion of three hundred pounds a year. In June 1762, Lord Halifax was placed at the head of the Admiralty: and the two Secretaries remained in Ireland, under the Earl of Northumberland, the new Lord Lieutenant, till the appoint-

ment of Lord Drogheda, as his Secretary, towards the end of 1763.

But, alas! the two Secretaries, and companions, Hamilton, and Burke, were ſoon, as politicians, to part for ever. With talents leſs uſeful, and brilliant, than Burke's, Hamilton enjoyed a high rank, and a conſiderable office, without a family to provide for: Burke was amply qualified by nature, and ſtudy, for private converſation, for public ſpeaking, and for writing, in almoſt every mode. Seeing that it was impoſſible to fix the irreſolution, or to rouſe the indolence of Hamilton, during times of perturbation, in which ambition cannot be idle, Burke gave him epiſtolary notice, "that he muſt politically aſſociate with "men of more active exertions;" having a family to maintain, and talents to diſpoſe of (x). He at the ſame time relinquiſhed the penſion, which he owed to his connection with Hamilton. Acting thus, like a wiſe man, who knew the world, and diſcerning the ſtage, on which he could act, Edmund Burke became private Secretary to the Marquis of Rockingham, as the firſt Lord of the Treaſury, in July 1765. He ſoon after came into Parliament, wherein having greatly diſtinguiſhed himſelf, he was equally noticed by the world. The place, he firſt repreſented in Parliament, was Wendover, through the recommendation of Lord Verney; with whom, on this occaſion, commenced an intimacy, which other intereſts, in the end, converted into diſagreement. Burke adhered, during every change of miniſters, to the fortunes of the Mar-

(x) The Life of Burke, p. 69.

quis,

quis, whether adverſe, or fortunate. Amidſt the claſh of parties, which ſucceeded the ſhifting of power, Burke produced ſeveral pamphlets, which at once ſhowed the vigour of his mind, proved the utility of his talents, and ſtrengthened his connections. In 1769, he publiſhed *his Obſervations on the preſent State of the Nation*; and *the* "Sentiments of an Engliſh "Freeholder *(y)*:" In May 1770, he gave out his "Thoughts on the Cauſes of the preſent Diſcontents," which Mrs. M^c^Aulay anſwered, as not being ſufficiently democratical. He continued his exertions, gained great popularity, roſe to high diſtinctions, in the ſtate, became the object of general admiration, and died, on the 8th of July 1797, full of years, and crowned with honourable fame.

The taſk of writing the life of Edmund Burke has been already executed by abler pens. In giving this ſketch, I had no other object, than, merely, to lay a proper foundation, for the ſuperſtructure of proofs, which I now propoſe to ſubmit to the candid reader, that this uncommon perſon was not the writer of Junius's Letters.

He was early ſuſpected, and is, at this day, confidently conſidered, as the real author of thoſe well known political papers. In October 1771, there was a letter, under the ſignature of ZENO, addreſſed "to "JUNIUS, alias Edmund, the Jeſuit of St. Omers *(z)*." About the ſame time, he was more expreſsly charged, as the author, by a writer, who *did know the ſecret.*

(y) Anecdotes of Bowyer, p. 412.

(z) Gent. Mag., 1771, p. 457.

While the profecutions were carrying on againſt the publiſhers of thoſe libels, "The genuine Letters of "Junius, to which are prefixed Anecdotes of the "Author," were re-publiſhed, in a pamphlet, without the name of the printer, or bookſeller. The internal evidence of theſe *prefatory anecdotes* demonſtrate, that they were written by Junius himſelf. They exhibit his figures, and inaccuracies; his ſophiſtry, and confidence; his vigour, and brilliancy: And, in the true ſpirit of *Philo-junius*, he is diligent to praiſe himſelf, "as the moſt eminent writer on politics, ſince the "acceſſion of the Houſe of Brunſwick." This is, certainly, one of the moſt artful, and audacious, publications, which the world has ever witneſſed. The writer aſſumes, with his uſual dexterity, that Edmund Burke was the Author, and calls him *Junius*, throughout the anecdotes, without once mentioning the name of Burke: But, the anecdote-writer gives an outline of his life. He mentions Burke's "Vindication of Na-"tural Society;" he ſpeaks of his "Origin of the "Sublime;" he cenſures his "Conſiderations on the "Cauſes of the preſent Diſcontents:" And, he thus, incidentally, detracts from the talents, and conſiſtency, of Edmund Burke; adding, for the purpoſe of deception, what he knew to be untrue, "that though the "ſtyle, and ſentiment, of the following letters be im-"puted to one writer, the materials of information, "with which they abound, were furniſhed by different "hands. *Junius* is, in this view, a JUNTO."

The malignant artifice of theſe prefatory anecdotes, Edmund Burke had penetration enough to ſee: And, from what he ſaw, we may perceive the cauſe, why he

voluntarily

voluntarily diſclaimed being the writer of Junius's Letters to the late Dr. Johnſon; why he aſſured Sir William Draper, that he was not the author; why he ſpoke to Mr. C— B— about Junius, in *terms of diſguſt*. Add to theſe ſtrong circumſtances what ſeems to be a deciſive proof: When the genuine edition of Junius was publiſhed by H. S. Woodfall, in 1772, under the legitimate authority of the real author, the prefatory anecdotes of the prior edition, being no longer wanted, were entirely ſuppreſſed: This, then, is a virtual declaration of Junius himſelf, that Edmund Burke was not the author of Junius's Letters: And, we now perceive, that the *prefatory anecdotes*, which were intended to delude, are at length brought, inſtructively, to undeceive all thoſe, who read for information, and amuſement, rather than for cavil, and diſputation.

Moreover, the internal evidence, whether we conſider the ſtyle, or the ſentiment, furniſhes ſtronger proof. Burke, in his ſtyle, has his figures; but they are chaſte, and correct. Junius too abounds in figures, without number, or correctneſs, or propriety. Burke would never have made Draper *repoſe* like Damiens, upon a bed of *torture*. Burke was a friend of government, by habit, and was only an oppoſitioniſt, by chance: Junius was an anarchiſt from nature, and ſtudy, and practice; nor could he write on politics, without inculcating revolutionary principles. And while Junius was writing thus democratically, Burke publiſhed his *Thoughts on the preſent Diſcontents*, which were avowed to be ariſtocratical; and which Junius cenſured, "as having expoſed the bare face of the "par-

"partiſan *(a)*." Burke always ſpoke with veneration of the Marquis of Rockingham, conſtantly defended the principles of his adminiſtration, and adhered ſteadily to his party, while his party adhered to themſelves: Junius ſpoke, contemptuouſly, of the Rockingham adminiſtration *(b)*. Thus, were Burke, and Junius, as contrary to each other, as contraries can be: As government to anarchy; as ariſtocracy to democracy; as legiſlative regulation to ſeditious innovation. When Draper, like a gentleman, aſked Burke, whether he were the author of Junius, Burke, like a man of ſenſe, and ſpirit, told him, that he was not the author: Had he been conſcious of guilt, he would have acted, as Junius ſaid he did, with petulance, and impropriety, and defiance *(c)*. None, but ſuch a lampooner, as Mathias, would remain ſuſpiciouſly ſilent, when he is charged with what degrades him, as a writer, and diſgraces him as a man, if he were not conſcious of guilt, and fearful of detection. Add to all thoſe proofs a ſtory, which the late Charles Townſhend, one of the deputy Tellers of the Exchequer, uſed to repeat, namely, that he one day met Burke, in Bond-ſtreet, full of indignation; and, inquiring the cauſe, Burke ſaid, that ſome good-natured friend had revived the report of his being the author of Junius. Wilkes, who received many letters from Junius, "ſcouted the notion of Mr. Burke being the "author of the epiſtles under that well-known ſig-

(a) In his prefatory anecdotes.
(b) Gen. ed. vol. i. p. 172, &c.
(c) In the prefatory anecdotes.

" nature *(d)*." After ſo many proofs, which carry conviction with them, it is unneceſſary to repeat what Burke ſaid, in parliament, with regard to Junius; becauſe his ſpeech was leſs grave, in its manner, than his private aſſeverations, and leſs concluſive, in its inferences, than his avowed ſentiments.

—JOHN DUNNING, Lord ASHBURTON—

Was one of thoſe ſingular men, who, by his talents, and ſucceſs, as a lawyer, made great party connections; and by means of his party connections, obtained a peerage. He was appointed ſolicitor-general, in December 1767, and reſigned his office, in March 1770; he was made chancellor of the dutchy of Lancaſter, in March 1782, and died in March 1783, at the age of fifty-three *(e)*. Now; the propoſition, with regard to this eminent man, and great lawyer, is, that he, being his Majeſty's ſolicitor-general, did, on the 19th of December 1769, write, and publiſh, a libellous letter, reviling the king's government, inſulting the king's perſon, and impugning that fundamental principle of the Britiſh conſtitution, which inſures the king's impeccability. Of this poſition, ſuch is the improbability, that it would require, to prove it, ſtronger evidence, than proofs of holy writ: Such is its abſurdity, that it cannot be made more abſurd by any argument, nor more ridiculous by any ſarcaſm.

(d) See Mr. C— B—'s letter in the Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, p. 347.

(e) Gent. Mag. 1783, p. 717. There are alſo anecdotes of Lord Aſhburton, in the European Mag. 1798, p. 81.

—JOHN

—JOHN ROBERTS.—

Of him, it uſed to be aſſerted, by the late Iſrael Maduit, who diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his *Conſiderations on the German War*, and thought, becauſe he knew much, that he knew every thing, that he was the writer of the Letters of Junius. Maduit uſed to aſſign, as his reaſon for that conjecture, what did little credit to his logic, that John Roberts, a man of talents, who had been connected with the Pelhams, died in 1772, ſix months after Junius had ceaſed to write, under that ſignature.

John Roberts, from being a clerk in the Treaſury, became private ſecretary to Henry Pelham, the chancellor of the Exchequer, who died, in 1754. John Roberts came into parliament for Harwich, in 1761, and continued to repreſent this borough, during his life. He took his place at the Board of Trade, in October 1761, in the room of Andrew Stone; but, he was ſuperſeded, by the appointment of Lord Orwell, in December 1762: He was again appointed, by the recommendation of the old Duke of Newcaſtle, to the ſame place, on the 20th July 1765, in which he uninterruptedly continued till his deceaſe, on the 13th of July 1772 *(f)*.

(f) Court Reg.; Gent. Mag. 1772, p. 373. There is a monumental ſtone in Weſtminſter Abbey, "To the memory of John Roberts, Eſq; ſecretary to the Right Honourable Henry Pelham, miniſter of ſtate to King George 2d. This marble was erected by his three ſurviving ſiſters, Suſannah, Rebecca, and Dorothy, 1776." The Gentleman's Magazine, which records his death, will preſerve his memory longer, than the pious marble of his grateful ſiſters.

The

The propoſition, with regard to John Roberts, then, is, that he, being one of his Majeſty's commiſſioners for the affairs of Trade and Plantations, did, on the 19th of December 1769, write a libellous letter, reviling the King's perſon, and inſulting the King's government. Maduit, when he made his gueſs, neither recollected dates, nor regarded circumſtances; neither did he advert, that Junius ceaſed to write, under that famous ſignature, in January 1772, and that John Roberts, who appears to have been an honeſt man, and a good ſubject, did not die till July in the ſame year *(g)*. A conjecture, which violates probability, no one needs be aſhamed to relinquiſh, nor afraid to diſbelieve.

—CHARLES LLOYD—

Owed a learned education to Weſtminſter, and to Cambridge; being admitted a ſcholar of St. Peter's, in 1749, at the age of fourteen, and elected to Cambridge, in 1754 *(h)*. He thence paſſed, in the tract

(g) John Roberts of Albemarle-ſtreet left a will; whereof his two unmarried ſiſters, Suſan, and Rebecca, were appointed the executrixes. He bequeathed a thouſand pounds to his couſin, John Hughſon, partly from affection, and partly, for the trouble of ſorting his papers, for the purpoſe of delivering thoſe, which did not belong to the teſtator's affairs, to "his honoured patroneſs, Lady Catherine Pelham," to whom he bequeathed a gold repeating watch, that he thankfully acknowledged to have received by her hands. He deviſed his whole eſtate, real, and perſonal, to be equally divided among his four ſiſters.

(h) The Liſt of the ſcholars of St. Peter's, p. 133—138.

of

of many an able man, into the Treaſury, as a Clerk; and thence went into the Exchequer, as a Deputy Teller. He was, certainly, an ingenious perſon, who wrote ſeveral pamphlets, which are now forgotten, amidſt a vaſt collection of political lucubrations, of meaner quality. He died inteſtate, on the 22d of January 1773 *(i)*: And, on the 10th of July, adminiſtration of his effects was granted to his brother, the Reverend Doctor Philip Lloyd, the Dean of Norwich; his mother having previouſly relinquiſhed her prior right.

Of Charles Lloyd it is ſaid, that he was the writer of Junius's Letters; becauſe there were found, by ſomebody, after his deceaſe, among his papers, ſome documents, that diſcovered him to have been the writer of thoſe Epiſtles; Epiſtles which required the attention of years, uncommon capacity, and peculiar habits to write; and which expoſed him to the riſque of ruin, without any adequate object.

With reſpect to him, the propoſition, then, is, that a Clerk of the Treaſury, and a Deputy Teller of the Exchequer, at the age of thirty-four, did compoſe Epiſtles, which reflected on the King's miniſters, and reviled the King's perſon; that he intrigued, as a reformer, with Wilkes; and, as a politician, entangled himſelf in the inextricable mazes of City-politics. He, who hopes, that this ſtory ſhould be credited, would do well to remember, that groſs improbabilities require the ſtrongeſt proofs to ſatisfy a reaſonable thinker.

(i) Gent. Mag. 1773, p. 48.

—SAMUEL

—Samuel Dyer.—

Of this learned perſon, it is alſo ſaid, that documents were found, after his deceaſe, among his papers, which ſatisfied the finder, whoever he were, that Samuel Dyer was the writer of Junius's Letters. But, two contradictory propoſitions cannot both be true: If Charles Lloyd muſt be deemed the author, becauſe papers were found in his repoſitories, which aſcertained the fact, Samuel Dyer could not be the author: If Samuel Dyer muſt be deemed the author of Junius's Letters, becauſe papers were found in his repoſitories, which aſcertained the fact, Charles Lloyd could not be the author of the ſame myſterious Epiſtles.

Samuel Dyer was the ſon of a jeweller in the city of London, who roſe to eminence, and wealth, by his induſtry. His parents, who were diſſenters, early deſtined their ſon for the diſſenting miniſtry. His more early education, he received from Profeſſor Ward, and Doctor Dodderidge: He proſecuted his ſtudies under Doctor Hutchinſon, in the univerſity of Glaſgow, where he applied himſelf to metaphyſics, and peruſed the Greek moraliſts. As Dr. Hutchinſon died, as we have ſeen, in 1746, Dyer muſt, of courſe, have ſtudied at Glaſgow before that year. He, at length, repaired to Leyden, in order to read Hebrew under Schultens, the celebrated orientaliſt. At the end of two years, he returned to England, eminently ſkilled in the languages, ancient, and modern, a great mathematician, and an intelligent naturaliſt: Added to all theſe endowments, he had a temper ſo mild,

mild, and a converſation ſo modeſt, as to attract attention, and to gain eſteem: Though he was a ſilent, rather than a talkative, perſon, he received many a ſummons, which he obeyed with the alacrity of a man of pleaſure, rather than of a man of ſtudy, to dinners, and card-parties.

Dyer made no haſte, however, to be a diſſenting miniſter. During this ſtate of heſitation, Doctor Chandler employed him, for a ſuitable reward, to tranſlate into Latin the religious tracts of Doctor Daniel Williams, for the purpoſe of gratuitous diſtribution: But, Dyer had made little progreſs, before the taſk grew irkſome; and the compleating of the tranſlation was put into a more induſtrious hand. Dyer ſhowed, on this occaſion, to his friends, that averſion from labour, which accompanied him through life. He now commenced a man of the world, whoſe company was courted, becauſe his accompliſhments were admired. On the 24th of April 1760, he was admitted a fellow of the Royal Society. Soon after the eſtabliſhment of the *Literary Club*, in 1764, he became an aſſociate with Johnſon, Burke, and other eminent characters, of that period. From his admiration of a French book, entitled *Les Mœurs*, Dyer was induced to tranſlate it into Engliſh, for Cave, the printer: Yet, his indolence could not be induced, by any motive, to compleat his undertaking. He was now ſtrongly preſſed by Johnſon, and his other literary friends, to write the life of Eraſmus: But, his ſettled habits of inattention, to any ſerious employment, reſiſted every effort of friendly perſuaſion. He was, however, induced, by the entreaties of Sharp, the ſurgeon, to engage in a work of leſs labour, the

the reviſion of the old tranſlation of Plutarch's Lives, for which, having by an unuſual effort of perſeverance compleated it, he received, from the liberality of Tonſon and Draper, the bookſellers, two hundred pounds. This effort ſeems to have greatly fatigued him; and he ſoon fell back into a deplorable ſtate of helpleſs indolence. Yet, he was not diſqualified from acting as a commiſſary to the troops in Germany, which he left in 1763, without the accumulation of a commiſſary's fortune.

For his maintenance, in this courſe of voluptuous idleneſs, he enjoyed, by the death of his relations, about £.8,000. in the public funds; which, after a while, he inveſted in the fluctuating ſtock of the Eaſt India Company. At the conteſted election, in April 1769, he tried, without ſucceſs, to be choſen a Director of the great machine of this commercial corporation *(k)*. He became a buyer of the public ſecurities, on time, and violated his engagements: He entered into real bargains for ſtock, which, as he was obliged to fulfil them, at whatever loſs, deprived him of his all. He was at laſt, probably, ruined by the well known fluctuations of the India Stock *(l)*. Soon after the completion of his ruin, he was ſeized with a quinſy: Yet, Sir John Hawkins leaves it doubtful, whether he were killed by it, or killed himſelf *(m)*. He certainly died

(k) Gent. Mag. p. 211. *(l)* Ib. 297.
(m) Life of Johnſon.

on the 15th of September 1772 *(n)*. "He left not," ſays his biographer, "in money, or effects, ſufficient "to defray the expence of a decent funeral; and the "laſt office of humanity towards him was performed "by one of thoſe who had been acceſſary to his "ruin *(o)*." The records of the Prerogative Office, which I have ſearched, ſeem to confirm Hawkins's averment: for, no will of Samuel Dyer, was found; but, the adminiſtration of his effects was granted to Lord Verney, a creditor, at the end of four months after his deceaſe.

Yet; this inefficient ſcholar is ſaid by ſome perſons, who knew not his idle habits, to have been the writer of the Letters of the active Junius; a taſk, which required the greateſt activity, and vigour; which ſhew extraordinary exertions of intellect, and uncommon flaſhes of genius. The ſtory is, that the late Sir Joſhua Reynolds, being the executor of Samuel Dyer, found ſome documents, among the teſtator's papers, which convinced the fictitious executor, of an unrecorded will, that the inactive Dyer wrote the Epiſtles of the enterprizing Junius *(p)*. A tale, which is thus ſhown

(n) Gent. Mag., 1772, p. 489.—Died, in Caſtle Street, Leiceſter Fields, to the unſpeakable loſs of his friends, the learned and worthy Samuel Dyer, Eſq., F. R. S. [Ann. Reg. p. 168.]

(o) Sir J. Hawkins's Life of Johnſon.

(p) The fact is, that on the 13th of January 1773, adminiſtration to the eſtate of Samuel Dyer, late of St. Martin in the Fields, was granted to the Right Honourable Ralph Earl Verney, a creditor by bond; William Cooley, Anne Cades, widow, Elizabeth Lane, the wife of William Lane, Mary Pynſent, ſpinſter, and

ſhown to be falſe, in its principal incident, would not deſerve much credit, if it were better ſupported by proof. Sir Joſhua Reynolds, certainly, uſed to ſay, that Samuel Dyer was the writer of Junius's Epiſtles *(q)* But, whether Sir Joſhua formed his opinion from the general character of Dyer, which would lead to a different inference, or from ſpecial intimations, which would conduct us to a juſt concluſion, does not appear: Neither are we, diſtinctly, informed why Dyer ſmarted under the new adminiſtration of the Duke of Grafton, when Burke, and greater men than Burke, were removed from power, in Auguſt 1766. If the rejection of Dyer, as a Director of the India Company, be the ſuppoſed ſmart, it would not follow very logically,

and Johanna Cock, the wife of John Cock, the couſins, and next of kin, having firſt renounced. It is ſaid by Mr. C. B. "that "on Dyer's deceaſe, who is now ſuſpected of being the Author of "Junius's Letters, the Burkes ſhowed infinite anxiety to get his "papers into their hands; as Mr. C. B. had heard." [Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, 349.] From knowing that Lord Verney was the adminiſtrator of Samuel Dyer, we may eaſily infer, that William and Richard Burke may have had a very different reaſon, for wiſhing to ſee the papers of the inteſtate, than mere curioſity about the writer of Junius's Letters.

(q) On this ſubject, my intelligent friend, before mentioned, has written to me as follows: "I muſt aſſure you, that I frequently "heard my moſt excellent friend, Sir Joſhua Reynolds ſay, that "Mr. Samuel Dyer wrote Junius. Dyer was an extraordinary "man; learned, ſagacious, ſarcaſtic in his manner, of almoſt inimi-"table ſilence in converſation, full of obſervation nnd penetra-"tion. At this time, he ſmarted under the new adminiſtration of "the Duke of Grafton, when Burke, &c. was turned out: Dyer "lived with Burke chiefly, and was Burke's aſſiſtant in matters "of calculation. Certainly Junius was written by ſome mor-"tified man."

that a ſubſequent injury could be the rational cauſe of a preceding attack: Junius began his Epiſtles in January 1769; and Dyer was rejected in April 1769. If that be true, for which there is rational authority, that Samuel Dyer was the intimate friend of Edmund Burke *(r)*, this circumſtance would prove, that Dyer did not write the letters of Junius: For, the principles of Burke and Junius ſtood oppoſed to each other: Junius, it has been ſhown, ſpoke contemptuouſly of the Rockingham adminiſtration: and, Burke uſed to ſpeak with indignant ſcorn of Junius: Dyer could have ſupplied more erudition, and ſcience, than Junius poſſeſſed. But, though Dyer could, certainly, have avoided the boyiſh blunders of Junius, he could not have attained to his dexterities of ſophiſtry, and figures of diction, even if he had been maſter of the activity of enterprize, and vigour of effort, which characterize the writings of our celebrated libelliſt. In litigious, and in fair, diſcuſſions, a paper, which is quoted as an authority, muſt be produced, in evidence, before it can be admitted in proof: And, therefore, the perſons, who ſpeak of the papers, which were found in Dyer's repoſitories, and which would eſtabliſh his pretenſions, as the true writer of Junius's Letters, ought to lay them before the public.

In making inquiries about Samuel Dyer, I have found gueſſers, who have confounded him with the Reverend John Dyer, who wrote the *Fleece*, and other poems; and, who died, in July 1758. If there were

(r) We have ſeen how affectionately the Annual Regiſter ſpoke of Samuel Dyer, after his death.

any other Dyer, than Samuel, who was in the leaſt likely to be the Author of Junius, I ſhould, in the courſe of my reſearch, have diſcovered, in the literary journals, one, who could not fail to appear, in every place, with his appropriate glare.

—JOHN WILKES—

Among other conjectures, which prejudice has made, and credulity has believed, with regard to the Author of Junius's Letters, ſuſpicion has mentioned this well known character.

John Wilkes was born, on the 27th of October 1727, the ſon of a diſtiller, in St. John Street, Iſlington-road, who, by a life of diligence, raiſed himſelf to wealth, and reſpectability. His earlieſt connections were among the diſſenters; his mother being a diſſenter, and his ſchool-maſter a diſſenting miniſter. Before he was three and twenty, he married Miſs Mead, who was a dozen years older than himſelf, and who was alſo a diſſenter, with a conſiderable fortune. Soon after his marriage, he ſettled at Ayleſbury, where he cultivated letters, and practiſed hoſpitality, with very little benefit to his fortune. But, as they were all diſſenters together, in principle, and in practice, this union ended in ſeparation.

He firſt emerged from privacy, in 1754, when he offered himſelf to the electors of Berwick-upon-Tweed, as their parliamentary repreſentative. It is curious to obſerve, that even thus early he began to cant about *the cauſe of liberty*, without carrying his election. He obtained a commiſſion in the Buckinghamſhire

militia, when it was firſt embodied. He became a member of a notorious club at Mednamham, in the ſame county. And, having deranged his affairs, by every mode of diſſipation; he tried expedients for raiſing money, which, his biographer fears, would not bear a ſtrict examination.

With the opening of a new reign, new proſpects dawned on John Wilkes. He was returned as a burgeſs, for Ayleſbury, to the parliament, which aſſembled in November 1761. He was prompted by his neceſſities to offer himſelf, as governor for Canada; but without ſucceſs: He propoſed to go as ambaſſador to Conſtantinople; without obtaining his end. And, he now, therefore, wrote his *Obſervations on the Papers relative to the Rupture with Spain.* On the 2d of June 1762, he began, with the aid of various coadjutors, to publiſh the *North Briton*; a publication, which was the ſource of his celebrity, and misfortunes, and the cauſe of his ultimate independence, and final repoſe. For the perſonal obloquy, which was caſt, by the North Briton, on individuals, he was challenged by individuals: For his libellous offences againſt the public, he was proſecuted by informations, in Weſtminſter-Hall, and by expulſion from the Houſe of Commons. He endeavoured to retaliate, by proſecuting all thoſe, who had been inſtrumental in proſecuting him. He was, however, obliged to ſeek for refuge in France. And he was, thereupon, outlawed, as a criminal, who had fled from the juſtice of his country.

His neceſſities compelled him to return to England, in 1766, with hopes which were, unexpectedly, diſappointed. His diſappointments drove him back

to

to Paris. Deſpair, at length, urged him to adopt the deſperate meaſure of defying the laws, and braving the legiſlature: So, in February 1768, he came to London; and ſoon after offered himſelf, as a candidate, to repreſent that city in parliament. His want of ſucceſs did not diſcourage him from offering himſelf as a repreſentative to the freeholders of Middleſex, who choſe him by a great majority: But, this choice, which occaſioned ſo many events, and ſo much controverſy, did not prevent him from being arreſted on a *capias utlagatum*; and from being, thereupon, committed to the King's Bench priſon, on the 27th of April 1768. On the 18th of June, he was ſentenced, on the two verdicts, which had been given againſt him, for publiſhing the North Briton, and the Eſſay on Woman, to be impriſoned two and twenty months, to pay two fines, each of five hundred pounds, and to find ſecurity for his good behaviour, during ſeven years. In the mean time, he obtained a reverſal of his outlawry, and a verdict againſt the ſecretary, and under-ſecretary of ſtate, for arreſting him, on ſuch general warrants, as had been always uſed. His fortunes, and misfortunes, were now balanced, in nearly equal ſcales. On the 27th of January 1769, he was choſen an alderman of London; on the 3d of February, he was expelled the Houſe of Commons: On the 16th of February he was re-elected; and on the ſubſequent day, he was again expelled: On the 16th of March he was a third time elected; and on the ſucceeding day, he was a third time expelled. At the fourth election, Colonel Luttrel appeared as his opponent, probably,

on a concerted plan; and, Mr. Wilkes being returned by a great majority, the Houſe of Commons, as the judicature of ultimate juriſdiction, on the ſubject of elections, determined, that the eligible perſon, was duly choſen, although he had the ſmaller number of legal votes, in oppoſition to an ineligible perſon, who had the greater number of votes, which, as thus given, were deemed illegal and inapplicable. This deciſion occaſioned a controverſy of a dozen years, which was, at length, ended by a compromiſe of party.

The time was now come, when the champion of liberty was himſelf to be free. On the 18th of April 1770, he regained his freedom; and took his place among the aldermen. But, enjoyment is ſeldom taſted without alloy. When the government ceaſed to proſecute him, he was perſecuted by his friends. An acrimonious controverſy, between him and his former ſupporter, Mr. Horne, for ſome time expoſed the partizans, and amuſed the town. It required the election of three ſucceſſive years to obtain the office of Lord Mayor. He, indeed, took his ſeat in the Houſe of Commons, as repreſentative of Middleſex, without an objection; becauſe there now was none. He, at laſt found, that proſperity enfeebled his power, in the ſame proportion, as adverſity had given him ſtrength. For the office of Chamberlain of the City, alderman Hopkins far out-voted him, on every trial. On the death of that reſpectable magiſtrate, in 1779, Mr. Wilkes obtained the office, which, as he executed it with fidelity, and diligence, made

made him eaſy all his life. He died, on the 26th of December 1797, aged ſeventy years *(s)*.

Among the various, and diſſimilar, characters, whom preſumption conjectured, to be the writer of the letters of *Junius*, was Wilkes, who was, mean time, a priſoner, and occupied with a thouſand intrigues, ſquabbles, and purſuits. It is a fact, which goes far towards deciding the queſtion, that Wilkes was a priſoner in the King's Bench, before Junius began to write, and for fifteen months afterwards: But, the free air of Junius was a ſufficient indication, that he was "a chartered libertine." We muſt, alſo, ſuppoſe, in compliance with that conjecture, that Wilkes had one altercation in the newſpapers, with Mr. Horne, as Wilkes, and another, with Mr. Horne, as Junius. We muſt, moreover, ridiculouſly ſuppoſe, that Wilkes correſponded with Wilkes. For, the patriot received many letters from Junius, the originals of which are ſaid to remain, in Miſs Wilkes's hands *(t)*. An intelligent perſon, who lived in great intimacy with Wilkes, from 1776 to 1784, ſays in evidence, that "Far from giving the leaſt hint, that he was the "author of Junius's Letters, he always explicitly

(s) There is in the European Magazine, 1798, p. 17-85-163, a good account of John Wilkes, Eſq. from which this ſketch is, chiefly, compiled. The only defect of it is, that it does not give the names of his father, and mother.

(t) See the Anti-Jacobin Review for July, p. 346-7-8.—And ſee the Gentleman's Magazine 1771, p. 584, for a ſingular letter "preſented by John Wilkes Eſq. to the Supporters of the Bill of "Rights, as the obſervations of the celebrated Junius." See the ſame letter in a new edition of the Letters of Junius, 1789, p. 368. and ſee it re-publiſhed in the genuine edition, v. 2. p. 351.

diſ-

"diſclaimed it, and treated it, as a ridiculous ſuppoſi-
"tion. No one acquainted with his ſtyle can ſuſpect,
"for a moment, that he was the author of them; the
"merit of his ſtyle was ſimplicity; he had both gaiety
"and ſtrength; but, to the rancorous ſarcaſms, the
"lofty contempt, with which Junius's Letters abound,
"no one was a greater ſtranger than Mr. Wilkes.
"To this may be added, the very ſlighting manner,
"in which Junius expreſſes himſelf of Mr. Wilkes.
"I am willing to admit, that if Mr. Wilkes had
"written Junius's Letters, he would have treated Mr.
"Wilkes uncivilly for the ſake of diſguiſing himſelf:
"But, ſneer, and, particularly, that kind of ſneer,
"which Mr. Wilkes, occaſionally, receives from
"Junius, you may be aſſured, Mr. Wilkes would
"never have uſed in ſpeaking of himſelf *(u)*."

I have

(u) See the remarks of Mr. C. B. on *Junius's Letters* in the Anti-Jacobin Review, p. 346–349.—I will ſubjoin an anecdote, which ſome readers will regard as ſtill more deciſive evidence. I have now before me Mr. Wilkes's edition of Junius's Letters, with MS. notes, which were written with his own hand. The firſt note is, "This edition is imperfect and incorrect. It was printed by Dryden Leach." Mr. Wilkes corrected the typographical errors with his own pen. His notes are neither many, nor important. The following paſſage in Junius's ninth letter, dated the 10th of April 1769, when Mr. Wilkes was in *durance*, he has underſcored. "But, "let Mr. Wilkes's character be what it may, this at leaſt is certain, "that circumſtanced as he is, with regard to the public, even his "vices plead for him." Mr. Horne had ſaid, in one of his letters to Junius: "Had I lived in thoſe times [the days of Charles the "Firſt] I would not have waited for chance to give me an oppor-"tunity of doing my duty; I would have fought him through the "ranks, and without the leaſt perſonal enmity, have diſcharged my "piece

I have heard it ſaid, that one of the biſhops, and that one of the judges, wrote Junius's Letters: I have been told, that A. B. C. and D. are the enigmatical ſignatures of the true author: But, I have not undertaken the endleſs taſk of proving, that the letters of *the croſs row* do not ſtand for the initials of the writer of Junius's Epiſtles. It is ſufficient for me, to deny the affirmation, which attributes the writing of ſuch lampoons to ſuch perſonages, as A. B. C. and D. He who is ſo preſumptuous as to ſtate ſuch abſurd improbabilities, as indubitable truths, ought to eſtabliſh his poſition by the ſtrongeſt proofs: For, the mind naturally rejects improbabilities, in favour of what is probable. It muſt be apparent to all, who are capable of reaſoning, that the confident aſſertions before-mentioned, as to particular perſons, being each the true author of Junius's Letters, are deſtroyed by ſuch contradictory affirmations, which are all of equal poſitiveneſs: For, there can be but one truth; and what is true, with regard to the firſt perſon, aſſigned as the writer of Junius's Epiſtles, muſt he neceſſarily falſe, as to the laſt; as what is true with regard to John Wilkes, the laſt perſon, muſt be falſe, in reſpect to Lord Sackville, the firſt imputed author. I will knit

"piece into his boſom *rather* than into any other man's." On this paſſage, Mr. Wilkes wrote the following obſervation: "Mr. "Horne copied this from a MS. marginal note in Mr. Wilkes's "Clarendon." We, hereby, ſee how readily Mr. Wilkes reclaimed his own. Had Junius, when he was hard preſſed, for an anſwer to Mr. Horne, known this to be a plagiariſm, how he would have triumphed over his too-powerful antagoniſt!

up

up the loop of this argument, by a remark of Sir John Davies:

" Perhaps ſomething, repugnant to her kind,
" By ſtrong antipathy, the ſoul may kill;
" But, what can be *contrary* to the mind,
" Which holds all *contraries* in *concord* ſtill!

SECONDLY: From the negative argument, which exhibits *contraries*, deſtroying each other, by their *antipathies*, as the effects of poiſon are deſtroyed by its antidote, I now proceed, in the ſecond place, to prove my affirmative poſition.

The myſtery, which has covered this ſecret, for thirty years, was raiſed partly by artifice, and partly by ſcepticiſm. Junius himſelf, with characteriſtic artifice, attributed, as we have ſeen, to Edmund Burke, the writing of his own lampoons. Various perſons, who thought well, no doubt, of their own powers of perception, attributed the writing of them to others, who were eminent for rank, or diſtinguiſhed for literature. The ſlighteſt circumſtances were caught at; in order to eſtabliſh conjectures, which would never have been made, if facts had been aſcertained, if deductions had been weighed, and if common ſenſe had been conſulted by ſelf-ſufficiency. The ſuppoſition, that the author was a man of rank, I have ſhown to be improbable. The notion, that the author was a great lawyer, I have proved to be groundleſs *(x)*. The aſſump-

(x) In Junius's Preface [p. xii.] to the corrected edition of his Letters, the author ſays, for the purpoſe of deception: " I am no " lawyer by profeſſion, nor do I pretend to be more deeply read " than

aſſumption, that the author was a profound ſcholar, I have alſo ſhown to be extremely problematical *(y)*.

There is, indeed, a double ſophiſm, with which ſcholarſhip has long deluded itſelf, and the world. It has been ſaid, and ſeldom contradicted, that Junius is the greateſt writer, who ever was, or ever will be; and it has been alſo ſaid, that Hugh M'Aulay Boyd wrote without knowledge, and without ſtyle. By thus elevating too much the one ſcale, and depreſſing too much the other, the equipoiſe of truth is loſt. It becomes, therefore, neceſſary, to reſtore a proper balance, by taking from, or adding to, either ſcale, as will beſt fix the certainty of truth between them.

Johnſon was not the firſt, who objected to the compoſition of Junius, as inaccurate in its figures, and inefficacious in its points. "Though I cannot think "the ſtyle of Junius free from criticiſm," ſays that philologiſt, "though his expreſſions are often trite, "and his periods feeble, I ſhould never have ſtationed "him, where he has placed himſelf, had I not rated "him by his morals, rather than his faculties *(z)*." There were other men of eminence, who did not *think*

"than every Engliſh gentleman ſhould be in the laws of his "country. If therefore the principles I maintain are truly con-"ſtitutional, I ſhall not think myſelf anſwered, though I ſhould be "convicted of a miſtake in terms, or of miſapplying the language "of the law." The fact is, that he was, at that epoch, only a ſtudent of law: For, he was not called to the Iriſh bar, till Eaſter-term, 1776.

(y) "His learning," ſays his biographer, "like his genius, "was more ſplendid, than profound."

(z) Falkland Iſlands, p. 124, of Johnſon's Political Tracts.

the

the ſtyle of Junius free from criticiſm. We now have it, in evidence, that Mr. Gibbon did not admire his ſtyle, as much as it was admired in general; "and he "told me, ſays Mr. C. B. that Mr. Fox thought "ſlightingly of it *(a)*." Mr. Wilkes had the diſcernment to obſerve, "that there was, from time to "time, a viſible improvement in the ſtyle of Ju-"nius *(b)*," though he did not perceive, that the defects aroſe not ſo much from the inexperience of age, as from the imbecility of youth. It was reſerved for me, in my humble purſuits, to produce the examples of inaccuracy, which, probably, induced ſuch men to *ſpeak ſlightingly of the ſtyle of Junius.*

As a proof of my poſition, I have already produced a dozen examples of bad Engliſh from one epiſtle. This proof has not been controverted. The *Philo-Junius's* of the preſent day turn off from examples, which they know not how to confute; and recur to the common ſophiſtry of re-aſſerting what has been diſproved, without adverting to the proofs of the previous confutation. Yes, indeed, one critic does alledge, that a dozen blunders, in one epiſtle, do not prove a celebrated author to be an inaccurate writer. But, there are readers, on whom examples of falſe grammar, will work conviction: And, to them, I ſubmit it, additionally, that the preface to the *corrected* edition of Junius contains a dozen blunders in the

(a) See the Letter of Mr. C— B—, in the Anti-Jacobin Rev. July 348.

(b) Ib. 347.

conſtruction

conſtruction of the Engliſh language *(c)*.——Unleſs prejudice be too ſtrong to admit conviction, it muſt at laſt be allowed, that Junius is an inaccurate writer. If he be an inaccurate writer, he ought not to be quoted as an Engliſh claſſic, whatever Mathias may ſay; nor can he be the greateſt writer, whatever critics may dogmatiſe.

Having, therefore, deducted ſomething from the ſcale of Junius, I will now add ſomething to the ſcale of M'Aulay. There are three works, which were, undoubtedly, written by Hugh M'Aulay Boyd; and which are before the public: *The Freeholder*, which was publiſhed, at Belfaſt, in 1776; *The Whig*, which was printed, in the London newſpapers, in 1779; and *The Obſerver*, which was publiſhed, periodically, at Madras, in 1793-4. Whoever peruſes theſe publications, with the leaſt attention, muſt perceive, that

(c) (1) "Preface" ſhould have the article *the* preceding it, according to the rule, whatever inattentive writers may ſcribble, or dogmatiſts may ſay. (2) "Good men appear to me to conſult their piety, as little as their judgment." [judgments.] (3) "*Both* miniſter *and* magiſtrate is [are] compelled"—(4) between his duty [their duties] and *his* reputation [their reputations] (5) "If he agreed [had agreed] in opinion, his diſcourſe was impertinent." [had been impertinent.] (6) "What hardſhips he im-"poſes on his fellow-ſubject" [fellow-ſubjects.] (7-8) We are told that judge and jury have a diſtinct "office;" that [the] judge and [the] jury have diſtinct offices. (9) "That the jury *is* to find the fact;—the jury *are* undoubtedly to determine the fact; The ſubſtantive jury cannot be both ſingular, and plural: And when the jury *have* received *their* charge.—(10-11) "If, in the courſe of the trial, any queſtion of law *ariſes* [ariſe]:—If I am [be] not groſsly miſtaken." (12) "*Elder* ſons," for *eldeſt* ſons.—(13) "National reflections, I confeſs, are not *juſtified* [juſtifiable] in theory, nor upon any general principles."

there

there are but few men, who can write lucubrations of ſuch vigour, and elegance. I proteſt againſt the judgments of thoſe critics, who *opine*, without peruſing what they either praiſe, or defame. Hugh M'Aulay, who could thus write, what few men can write, muſt be allowed to have been a perſon of uncommon powers. I do not ſay, that there is much matter in any of thoſe acknowledged works of his: But, what matter is there in Junius? They do not diſplay, indeed, much learning: But, what learning has Junius? M'Aulay's writings have, in common with Junius, facility, and elegance, (if elegance and inaccuracy can exiſt together,) confidence, and vigour, numerous figures, which are not always conſiſtently uſed, and abundant finery, which does not fitly adorn what it was meant to dignify. The ſuppoſition, that M'Aulay wrote Junius's Letters is not, then, "too abſurd for diſcuſſion;" as that commentator conceived, who gave an opinion, from knowing the perſon of M'Aulay Boyd, without having peruſed his productions *(d)*; like a lawyer, who ſhould rather look at his client's face, than his client's brief, when he is about to give his profeſſional opinion: The abſurdity, therefore, was not ſo much in me, who had ſtudied the character of M'Aulay, and peruſed his *Freeholder*, his *Whig*, and his *Obſerver*, as in thoſe, who *laughed at the idea of* M'Aulay being the writer of Junius's Epiſtles, without reading what he had written, or knowing his character.

Of Hugh M'Aulay, who is thus, oppoſitely, held

(d) Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, p. 348–9.

up,

up, curioſity muſt wiſh to know a little more. He was the ſecond ſon of Alexander M'Aulay o the county of Antrim, in Ireland, a barriſter of a ſmall eſtate, by the eldeſt daughter of Hugh Boyd of Ballycaſtle, in the ſame ſhire, who is ſtill remembered, in his country, for having, by his induſtry, his prudence, and his ſagacity, amaſſed a conſiderable eſtate; and is recorded, in the journals of the Iriſh parliament, as the perſon who obtained conſiderable ſums from the miſtaken munificence of the Iriſh Commons, for conſtructing the harbour of Ballycaſtle *(e)*.

Alexander M'Aulay roſe to notice by his diligence of application, rather than his knowledge of law, by the ſteadineſs of his perſeverance, more than the brilliancy of his oratory. He was made one of the king's counſel at law, for the kingdom of Ireland, whilſt that diſtinction was more coveted, becauſe it was leſs common than it is at preſent: And, he was appointed the judge of the conſiſtory court; a promotion, which he had amply earned by his vigorous defence of eccleſiaſtical rights. In early life, he had diſtinguiſhed himſelf by his political treatiſes: But, the firſt of his pamphlets, which attracted much public notice, was "*Property Inviolable*," publiſhed about the year 1737. In this tract, which diſplayed the determined ſpirit of the man, he expoſed, and reprobated, the proceedings of the Iriſh Commons, who arrogated to

(e) There is, in the 7th vol. of the Iriſh Journals, p. 501–42, an intereſting report on that expenſive work, which was intended to ſupply Dublin with cheap coal; but which terminated, only, in the improvement, and increaſe of Mr. Boyd's private fortune.

themſelves the right of deciding upon the clergy's title to the *tithe of agiſtment*, by a vote of their houſe alone. Neither Hampden, who oppoſed the ſhip-money of a King, nor Stowell of Exeter, who ſtood upon his defence againſt the arbitrary impriſonments of a Houſe of Commons, at a factious epoch, deſerve greater celebration, for their magnanimous defence of national liberty, than M'Aulay highly merited, for his undaunted firmneſs, in defending the undoubted rights of the clergy, againſt proceedings, which were unwarranted by any principle of the conſtitution, and indefenſible by any maxim of the law of the land. M'Aulay ſhowed, very diſtinctly, that the Houſe of Commons, by a parity of proceeding, might equally attempt, to vote down the whole church of Ireland *(f)*. By this great ſervice, M'Aulay obtained the hearts of the clergy, and gained the ſoul of Dean Swift. A vacancy in parliament, for the univerſity of Dublin, ſoon after happened: M'Aulay offered himſelf to repreſent that learned body, in oppoſition to Philip Tiſdal, a lawyer, who roſe by his talents, and merit, to be attorney-general, a privy counſellor, and the Iriſh ſecretary of ſtate. Swift obtained for M'Aulay, by means of Sir George Lyttelton, the active influence of the Prince of Wales, the chancellor of that univerſity *(g)*: Dr. Baldwin, the provoſt of Trinity college, ſupported him, who had ſupported the church: And, M'Aulay carried his election, by a majority of one.

(f) See the Iriſh Journ. vol. 6. p. 658.—Boulter's Letters, vol. 2. paſſim, on the point.

(g) Swift's Letter, dated 5th June 1739.

Tiſdal,

Tiſdal, however, petitioned the Houſe of Commons, from whom M'Aulay could hope for little fairneſs, and for no favour, as he had, particularly, offended the Speaker, Boyle: And, he was of courſe voted out, as unduly choſen *(h)*. Whether Hugh M'Aulay remembered his father's wrong, at a ſubſequent day, I will not conjecture: Certain it is, that the father was obliged to purchaſe a ſeat in the Houſe of Commons, ſince he could not obtain a reſpectable one by ſuffrage. He took an active part in the buſineſs of parliament: He was deemed "a formal, phlegmatic, "monotonous ſpeaker;" but was reſpected, as a ſenſible, well-informed man: What he, no doubt, deemed a greater honour, than his ſeat in the Houſe of Commons, yet awaited him: In 1740, Dean Swift bequeathed him, in terms of the warmeſt affection, and, indeed, in expreſſions moſt flattering to his talents, and virtues, the gold box, in which the freedom of the city of Dublin had been preſented to himſelf.

Alexander M'Aulay preſerved his importance, becauſe he continued his exertions, till his death. As the King's learned counſel, he publiſhed, in 1763, "An Enquiry into the Legality of Penſions on the "Iriſh Eſtabliſhment:" He concludes his *impeachment of penſions*, by exclaiming: "If ſuch penſions be "found on the Iriſh eſtabliſhment; let ſuch be cut "off; and let the perfidious adviſers be branded with "indelible characters of public infamy, adequate, "if poſſible, to the diſhonour of their crime."—M'Aulay, who had been all his life an opponent of

(h) Iriſh Com. Journ. 7 vol. p. 110.

the Engliſh government of Ireland, changed his tone, during the Earl of Hertford's adminiſtration: And, "finding an author *under the maſk of patriotiſm*, had "lately publiſhed a pamphlet of evil tendency," M'Aulay ſent forth, in January 1766, "Septennial "Parliaments vindicated," which he addreſſed to the Lord Lieutenant. He had not, however, the ſatisfaction of living to ſee the eſtabliſhment of octennial parliaments, which took place, during the adminiſtration of Lord Townſhend. He died, after a laborious life of profeſſional duties, on the 13th of July, 1766; leaving two ſons, and two daughters, who had all been aſſiduouſly educated by two very capable parents *(i)*: His eldeſt ſon Alexander, who had been bred to the bar, ſettled on the family eſtate of Glenville,

(i) Gent. Mag. 1766, p. 343. "Died, Alexander M'Aulay, "M. P. for Thomaſton." My inquiries at Dublin have aſcertained the identity of the deceaſed, who was thus deſcribed. I will add an anecdote or two of Alexander M'Aulay, from the information of a moſt reſpectable man, who remembers, very diſtinctly, the occurrences of thoſe times, in Ireland: M'Aulay once ſpoke, for three days, in a Chancery cauſe, to the great annoyance of old Lord Bowes, the Chancellor.—When the parliament was to be prorogued, in 1766, M'Aulay, hearing, that Dr. Lucas intended to make an inflammatory motion, on the laſt day of the ſeſſion, came early into the Houſe, with the deſign to diſappoint him. The moment the Speaker took the chair, M'Aulay got up, ſaying that, as he underſtood the order of the day to be the ſtate of the nation, he would, with the leave of the Houſe, run over the ſtate of the nation, from the invaſion of Henry the Second, to the preſent day. Dr. Lucas ſeeing himſelf circumvented, interrupted him indignantly: But, the Speaker decided in favour of M'Aulay. The Doctor broke out half a dozen times: But, the Speaker always put him down, by ſaying, that the gentleman on the floor, muſt be allowed

ville, and married the ſiſter of Lord Gosford; his ſecond ſon is the memorable object of the preſent inquiry: One of the daughters married Mr. Adair, a relation of the late ſerjeant; the other daughter married John Godley of the county of Armagh, Eſq; and is, according to the obſervation of my intelligent informant, "a lady, highly gifted, and accompliſhed."

Such was the father of Hugh M'Aulay, who was born, on the 16th of April 1746, a day, which will always be memorable, in our annals, for the deciſive battle of Culloden field. Dublin, which had produced an USHER, and a BURKE, has alſo the honour of giving birth to Hugh M'Aulay, at his father's houſe, in Ship-ſtreet. His father, as I have already ſhown, from good authority, was extremely attentive to the education of his children. Hugh himſelf uſed to ſay "that he was put very young to ſchool, and "ſoon became much attached to books *(k)*" But, the Metamorphoſes of Ovid firſt ſtruck his attention, and beſt amuſed his infancy, as this poet had amuſed the childhood of Milton, and had attracted the notice of Ruddiman. He felt no ambition, like them, to diſplay his premature ſcholarſhip, by making Latin verſes; and from my inquiries at Dublin, I am led to believe, that he did not copy the example of

allowed to make his motion. At the end of an hour and a half, the Black Rod put an end to the ſpeech; and the Parliament.—On the 5th of November 1771, Doctor Lucas died. The corporation of Dublin ſettled a penſion of fifty pounds a year on his widow. [Gent. Mag. 1772, p. 42.] But, M'Aulay, the oppoſnent of penſions, was now dead!

(k) Life by his Editor.

Pope, in trying to gratify his father, by compoſing Engliſh rhymes. But, it is a fact, which is more important to ſtate, that his father, "who laboured "anxiouſly his education, and fondly ſaw in his bud-"ding parts the promiſe of a copious harveſt, *ſome-"times cenſured his ſon's* PROSE, for being *too* POETI-"CAL, and preſcribed, as a model to him, the chaſte "ſtyle of Swift, and Addiſon; "'that he might "'learn'" (to uſe the old man's own words) "'to com-"'bine the ſtrength and preciſion of the one, with "'the ſimplicity and eaſy elegance of the other *(l)*.'" The ſeeds, however, of poetic imagery, which Nature had ſcattered in M'Auley's mind, never ripened into a harveſt of poetry. He was educated at the ſchool of the Reverend William Ball, in Ship-ſtreet, before mentioned; a ſchool, which, among other diſtinguiſhed ſcholars, and characters, ſent forth Lord Clare, and Henry Grattan; who, being nearly of the ſame age, were of the ſame claſs, with Hugh M'Aulay; and yet remained a year behind him in Ship-ſtreet.

The ſtep from the ſchool to the college forms an important epoch in the biography of youth. Our ſtudent "was received, as a fellow commoner, into "the univerſity of Dublin, by the name of Hugh "M'Aulay, on the 8th of July 1761 *(m)*." Here,

(l) From the letter of my very well informed correſpondent at Dublin.

(m) I learned this important fact from the obliging information of the Rev. Doctor George Hall of Trinity College Dublin: And this fact proves, that our ſtudent ſtill, at that time, paſſed by his father's name; and ſhows, incidentally, that the ſtory of Hugh M'Aulay being always called Boyd, which is told by ſome intelligent men in Ireland, is unfounded.

he

he is ſaid, by his biographer, to have purſued his favourite ſtudies, with aſſiduity, and delight: He *certainly acquitted himſelf* with *credit*, as I have been aſſured by a claſs-fellow of our ſtudent, in the ſame college. He obtained his Batchelor of Arts degree, in 1765. He thus continued long enough, in Trinity College, to be *highly cultivated*, and to poſſeſs *conſiderable talents*, as I have been told by the ſame learned, and diſcerning, claſs-fellow of his. He could not well be otherwiſe from his natural endowments. He had a *memory* of *ſingular ſtrength*; he had an apprehenſion of great readineſs; an intellect of uncommon ſolidity; and beſides all thoſe faculties, he enjoyed a wonderful dexterity, in applying them to every purpoſe: The characteriſtic preciſion, with which he carried off the ſpeeches of the greateſt orators, is alone a ſatisfactory proof, that he enjoyed all thoſe powers, in a high degree: And it is a ſtrong confirmation of this reaſoning, that he was a good cheſs-player, and made a ſtand againſt Count BRUHL.

Like other young men of powerful minds, and irregular practices, he remained, for ſome time, in ſuſpence, about the choice of his profeſſion. He inclined, for a while, to prefer the ſword to the gown; as his eldeſt brother Alexander had already entered himſelf of the Temple. After ſome conſideration, he determined, however, from the propenſities of his habit, to follow the profeſſion of his father. In the mean time, Hugh M'Aulay, owing to his paſſion for play, and diſſipation, became involved, as we are told by his

biographer, " in great pecuniary difficulties, at the age " of *nineteen* [1765."] *(n)*.

With all thoſe embarraſſments, practices, and habits, he came to London, before the deceaſe of his father, on the 13th of July 1766 *(o)*; in order to proſecute the ſtudy of the law *(p)*. But, the propenſities of our ſtudent carried him as often to St. Stephen's Chapel, as to Weſtminſter Hall: He uſed frequently to retire from a long debate to *the Grecian* " [coffee houſe], where he met his fellow Templars; " and would ſometimes aſtoniſh them by a ſeemingly " perfect recital of the *chef dœuvre* of the night *(q)*." He is, at this time, deſcribed by another lawyer, who knew him perſonally, " as a good-natured, lively, man, " famous for repeating [parliamentary] ſpeeches; and

(n) The Preface to the Indian Obſerver, p. xvi.

(o) I think it more than probable, that the notice of the death of his father, which appears, in the Gentleman's Magazine, was communicated by Hugh M'Aulay, who was, at the time, near the Editor, in London.

(p) It is ſuppoſed by ſome very well-informed lawyers, at Dublin, that Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd *was called to the Bar, in England.* But, it is a fact, which I ſtate upon the credit of a very careful ſearch of the Regiſters, belonging to the four Inns of Court, that he was never entered in any of the Inns, by either of his names of M'Aulay, or of Boyd. This is a curious circumſtance in itſelf; and ſhows clearly, how much preferable circumſtantial evidence is to the exceeding fallibility of human teſtimony. It is ſufficiently known, with what accuracy thoſe Regiſters are kept: and, it follows of courſe, that M'Aulay-Boyd *was never called to the Bar, in England.*

(q) From the information of a lawyer of great eminence at Dublin, who was, at that time, a templar with M'Aulay.

" always

"always buſtling about ſomething or another(r)." As to his *politics*; M'Aulay, partly from the place of his birth, partly from the example of his father, partly from his natural temperament, and partly from the factiouſneſs of the times, was an Anarchiſt, if we may conſider his avowed writings, as preferable proofs, to private prejudice: As a *Whig*, he was *Whig-iſſimus*; not an Old Whig, but a new Whig, who exerted great activity in promoting "the good Old Cauſe(s)." If, from *the Whig*, we throw a retroſpective glance upon the Letters of the *Freeholder* to the *Electors* of *Antrim*, in 1776, we ſhall perceive, that he then maintained revolutionary doctrines, in order to influence an election(t). If, from theſe letters, we take another retroſpect

(r) Anti-Jacobin Review, July, 348.

(s) See *the Whig* in Almon's Anecdotes, v. iii. p. 1. I yield willing obedience to the juridical rule, which requires, that he who offers a document in evidence, ought to verify it, and connect it with the cauſe in iſſue. Mr. Almon is the principal witneſs, on this litigated queſtion: and, he ſays, that in 1779, and 1780, he publiſhed a Newſpaper, called the *London Courant*; that he was perfectly acquainted with the chief writers in it, and with Hugh Boyd, particularly; and that he does know, that Hugh Boyd was the undoubted writer of the eſſays in it, which were entitled *The Whig*; and which were publiſhed, in that newſpaper, during the months of November, and December, 1779, and of January, and March 1780.

(t) Hugh Boyd was diſcovered to be the author of the *Freeholder's Letters*, "by finding a ſcrap of the manuſcript copy, which "the printer had neglected to deſtroy." [The Life of Boyd, p. 18.] Having written to an intelligent friend, at Belfaſt, for a copy of *The Freeholder's Letters*, he wrote me, in anſwer, on the 19th of October 1799: "I will make a point of ſearching the "bookſellers ſhops for the pamphlet, you write for: The *Letters* "are

troſpect of ten years, we ſhall eaſily diſcover the political principles, which M'Aulay brought with him from the noiſy ſcene of Dr. Lucas, at Dublin, to the more ample theatre of Wilkes and Liberty, at London.

Hugh M'Aulay was naturally recommended to the care of Mr. James Adair, an Iriſh factor, in the city, the father of the late Serjeant, and his own relation, in whoſe houſe, he, for a while, became domeſticated. The genteel addreſs, and inſinuating manners, of M'Aulay, eaſily, introduced him into faſhionable life, and literary ſociety. He became intimate with Mr. Richard Burke, whoſe principles, and habits, are ſaid to have been ſimilar to his own. He gained ready admiſſion into the families of Mr. Edmund Burke, and of Sir Joſhua Reynolds. He obtained the familiarity of Garrick. He became acquainted with many of the members of the *Literary Club (u)*. And, becoming a *Man of the Town*, he, incidentally, *became all things to all men*. It is ſeldom, that any youth gains ſo many friends, as M'Aulay, and by his friends is ever ſo much beloved; as it appears, that he was. From thoſe intimations, we may perceive the ſources of much of his information, as a political writer, if we conſider, that he had great readineſs of apprehenſion, and ſtill greater ſtrength of memory; that he poſſeſt, in a high degree,

" are within the recollection of ſeveral of my acquaintance, who " tell me, they were written by a M'Aulay-Boyd, who went to " India with Lord Macartney." It is a fact, then, which is notorious amongſt the well informed men of Belfaſt, that M'Aulay Boyd wrote *The Freeholder's Letters*.

(u) See his Life prefixed to the *Indian Obſerver*, p, 5, 6.

the important faculty of knowing, when to ſpeak, and when to be ſilent; how to gain, and how to keep a ſecret: This, then, is the character to impoſe on mankind!

But, whatever a man's friendſhips, and occupations, may be, the principal epoch of his life is his marriage. From Hugh M'Aulay's connections, in the city, he probably became acquainted with Miſs Frances Morphy, a girl of elegance, and of ſome fortune, who lived with her mother, at lodgings, in Muſcovy Court, Tower-hill: And, her he married, on the 29th of December, 1767, when he was yet under two-and-twenty; and ſhe was ſtill younger *(x)*. The mother, and the daughter, poſſeſſed between them, about

(x) "Hugh Macaulay, Eſq; of the pariſh of St. Paul Covent "Garden Batch^r and Frances Morphy of this pariſh ſpinſter, were "married, in this church, by licence, this twenty-ninth day of "December, in the year one thouſand ſeven hundred and ſixty-"ſeven, "By me George Baxter, A. M.

"This marriage was ſolemnized between us { Hugh M'Aulay, Frances Morphy.

"In the preſence of { Will: Thornton, H: Macleane."

"N. B. The above is a copy of the marriage regiſter of the pariſh of Allhallows Barking, taken this tenth day of December, one thouſand ſeven hundred and ninety-nine by me, James Roe, curate."——The Reverend George Baxter is ſtill alive; and not only recollects this marriage, but that he partook of the wedding-dinner, in the New Road, Chelſea. He remembers, that M'Aulay appeared to him, at that time, as a very intelligent, lively, and converſable, young man; that he afterwards dined with him, in Great Marlborough-ſtreet: And, he thinks he heard, that M'Aulay changed his name to Boyd, about a twelvemonth after his marriage. Mrs. Morphy is ſtill remembered, in Muſcovy-court.

ſeven

ſeven thouſand pounds, ſterling, which conſiſted of negroes, and other property, in Jamaica. We have here record-evidence to prove again, that he ſtill paſſed by his father's name, in 1767, at the era of his marriage. His mother's father is ſaid to have died, in 1765: But, we are aſſured, that "the bequeſt "of his maternal grandfather did not fall to him till "ſometime after his marriage; and that when he got "the eſtate, it was ſo much encumbered with an-"nuitants, and haraſſed by conſequent litigations as "to afford him hardly any relief *(y)*." As his own father did not die opulent, we may eaſily ſuppoſe, that the ſon was deprived, in 1766, at once, of the benefit of a parent's advice, and of the reſource of a father's purſe.

Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd, was now to maintain a wife, and family, as well as he could, by whatever means. "Towards the latter end of the year 1768, we are "told, Mr. Boyd, who, at that period reſided in "Great Marlborough-ſtreet *(z)*, began to be ex-

(y) Pref. to the Indian Obſerver, xvi.—It was, in conſequence of the will of his maternal grandfather, that he changed his name to Boyd. Upon inquiry at the Secretary of State's office, and at the College of Arms, I learned, that Hugh M'Aulay never obtained the King's licenſe, for changing his name, I merely ſtate the fact. In England, perſons of greater conſequence ſometimes neglect this uſeful form. In Ireland, it is never attended to.

(z) I will admit, that he *reſided*, at the time mentioned, in Great Marlborough-ſtreet, in St. James's pariſh: But, it is proper, that I ſhould ſtate, that having ſearched the books of St. James's pariſh, I could not find, our politician was a *houſe-keeper*, either by the name of M'Aulay, or Boyd, in this pariſh, from 1767, to 1774; as he does not appear to have been aſſeſſed to parochial taxes.

"tremely

" tremely ſedulous in collecting political information
" of every kind; and being in habits of confidential
" intimacy with the late Mr. Laughlin Maclene, as
" well as ſome other political characters, he was ena-
" bled to obtain very early and accurate intelligence
" of all miniſterial proceedings *(a)*." Yet; he who had read newſpapers, at Dublin, from 1761 to 1765, with the intellect, and memory of M'Aulay; he who had read political papers, at London, from 1766 to 1768, and attended both houſes of parliament, with his readineſs of apprehenſion, and tenacity of recollection; he, who had lived, in the familiar habits of relationſhip, with the late Serjeant Adair, from 1765 to 1769; had not to *begin* the ſtudy of politics, in 1768. M'Aulay, certainly, publiſhed, during that period, ſome eſſays, under the ſignature of DEMOCRITUS, which were a ſort of intellectual exerciſes, that were much in practice, at that feveriſh period, among the beſt educated of the Iriſh Templars, who thronged the bar of the Houſe of Lords, and the gallery of the Houſe of Commons, more than Weſtminſter Hall *(b)*. It is, therefore, in vain, to talk, in the face of facts, of the commencement of M'Aulay's political ſtudies, in 1768. A ſtrong cauſe is never ſo effectually betrayed, as by the offer of weak arguments to ſupport it. If I might aſſume, for a moment, that M'Aulay-Boyd was the writer of Junius's Letters, I

(a) The Editor's letter of the 4th of Auguſt laſt. [Morn. Chron.]

(b) From the information of my well informed correſpondent of the Iriſh bar, at Dublin.

could

could eaſily ſhow how he was employed in 1769 *(c)*, in 1770 *(d)*, and in 1771 *(e)*. Junius ceaſed to write, under that ſignature, in January 1772; becauſe, he was unable, from the diſtreſſed circumſtances of the writer, to live any longer, in London. The place of his retirement was Raſton-Green, near Harrow. In this retirement, he found leiſure to regret the paſt, and to provide for the future. From that place, he uſed frequently to walk to town, and to return the ſame day; for the purpoſe, no doubt, of providing for his family *(f)*, and of collecting intelligence.

Diſtreſs

(c) The firſt letter of Junius was dated on the 29th of January 1769; which was followed, in the ſame year, by thirty letters, under the ſignatures of Junius, and Philo-Junius, "beſides the numberleſs trifles, which he had written, without being able to recal "them to his memory." [Gen. ed. vol. 2. p. 230.]

(d) He wrote only ſix letters, in 1770, if we may judge from what he re publiſhed in his genuine edition; having ceaſed to print, under thoſe ſignatures, during the proſecutions againſt his printers, and bookſellers.

(e) In 1771, he publiſhed five and twenty letters: and three or four papers, in 1772; under his uſual ſignatures.

(f) A writer in the *True Briton* of the 24th October 1799, under the ſignature of VERAX, has ſketched, with ſo nice a pencil, *an account of Hugh Boyd*, about the year 1774, that I will lay it before the reader, as I have nothing ſo characteriſtic to exhibit:

"Hugh Boyd was the ſecond ſon of a Mr. Macauly, whoſe "father was one of Dean Swift's executors. He changed his "name for an eſtate of about £. 300 per annum: he was a tall, "well proportioned man, and rather athletic; his complexion was "fair, he wore his own hair, twiſted behind: his countenance was "fixed, grave, and very ſtrongly marked; his noſe was prominent, "his mouth wide, his cheeks lank, and his eyes very large, inſo-

"much

Diſtreſs is ſeldom ſtationary: and M'Aulay-Boyd returned, with his family, to London, probably in 1775.

" much that he could command them more ſideways than any " other perſon I ever ſaw: as he could ſee ſideways more than ano- " ther, ſo did he turn his neck aboat to ſee leſs than any other, ſo " that he often had the appearance of having a ſtiff neck: he was, " from the rotundity of the orb of the eye, near ſighted, for " which reaſon, as he walked the ſtreets he generally uſed a glaſs, " which hung from his neck: he was thin about the ſhoulders, al- " though they were broad, and his ſhoulders were rather high: " his dreſs was very plain; he wore always a cocked hat; his " walk was quick, and his mood was penſive. Nobody of ob- " ſervation could have paſſed him without wiſhing to know who " he was.

" It was about the year 1774, that I firſt knew Mr. Boyd; when " he was about twenty-ſeven years old, but he looked older: his " reſidence then was at Ruſton Green, near Harrow, from thence " he frequently walked to London and back again the ſame day. " Whenever he ſlept in town, he generally took up his abode with " one friend or another, for no man had more real friends. He " was then married to a Miſs Morphy. a lady from Jamaica, " who had an annuity, and whoſe mother was ſtill living. I was " told at that time that Mr. Boyd had gamed and injured his for- " tune, and that he once played a match at tennis, with a [negro] " boy tied to his back:—but when I knew him he had relinquiſh- " ed tennis; for though I frequented the court, I never ſaw him " play but once; indeed his ſight was againſt him. Mr, Boyd " was a good player of cheſs, and made a ſtand againſt Count " *Bruhl.*

" Having diſſipated his fortune, and the annuity of Mrs. Boyd " not being enough for his mode of living, Mr. Boyd contracted " the habit of raiſing the means, which flung him out of every " ſteady purſuit of life, gave him a countenance of care, and " made him look as if he was forming great plans—when the " fact was, that he was only thinking how to live. This ſituation " certainly haraſſed him very much; and at length it became " his practice to reſort to the mode of ſupply alluded to. All " other attentions, inſtead of an improvement of the underſtand-

" ing,

1775. At this epoch of his life, he engaged in a very arduous taſk, when he undertook to perſuade the world, that Robert, and Daniel, Perreau were innocent of the felonious charge of forging the Bond of William Adair, with deſign to defraud Robert, and Henry, Drummond *(p)*. The forgery was detected, in March 1775: bills of indictment were found againſt them, on the 25th of April. They were tried, not long after; when Robert Perreau read a defence, of uncommon art, and ability, elegance, and pathos, which very much affected thoſe, who were, nevertheleſs, conſtrained, by the evidence, to find him guilty. Daniel Perreau was alſo found guilty. Notwithſtanding every endeavour to ſave them, they were both executed, on the 17th of January 1776 *(q)*.

What

" ing, ſerved rather to diſſipate, than to amuſe a mind depreſſed " with the burthenſome care of ways and means. For if Mr. " Boyd had been free from ſuch neceſſities, he certainly had an " underſtanding and an education equal to moſt of his time, and " to any undertakings.

" His memory was wonderful—He wrote the ſpeech of Lord " Chatham, after he came from the Houſe of Lords, before he " ſlept. *I ſaw him whilſt he was about it.* The great excellence " of that ſpeech conſiſts in the exactneſs of it. It was not merely " what Lord Chatham meant, but what he actually ſaid. No- " body who read it, can heſitate to ſay but it muſt be what Lord " Chatham ſaid."

(p) I remember, very well, ſays Mr. C—B—, " the infinite " pains he took to perſuade the world that the Perreaus were " innocent." [Anti-Jacobin Rev. for July, p. 349.]

(q) Gent. Mag. 1775, p. 148, 205. 279, 289. Coupling the fact, *that Boyd took infinite pains to perſuade the world of the Perreaus*

What Boyd's connections were, with thoſe noted ſwindlers, I am unable to tell. He appeared, immediately, after their fate was decided, in the North of Ireland. Whatever motive carried him thither, his attention was at once drawn to it, by the ſound of an election, for the county of Antrim, in purſuance of the parliamentary limitation, for which his father had written. Aſſuming the familiar appellation of a *Freeholder*, he addreſſed a dozen letters to the independent electors of Antrim; in order to gain their votes, for "a CONSTITUTIONAL CANDI-"DATE." It was one James Wilſon, an obſcure adventurer, who was thus ſupported by M'Aulay Boyd, againſt all the Ariſtocratic, and leading, intereſts of that conſiderable ſhire *(r)*. "Theſe let-"ters,"

Perreau's innocence, with the uncommon force of Robert Perreau's defence, I am led to entertain a ſtrong ſuſpicion, that this elaborate argument was written by the eloquent pen of Boyd. Take the two firſt paragraphs, as an example: "My Lords, and Gen-"tlemen of the Jury; If I had been wanting in that fortitude, "which is the reſult of innocence, or had found any heſitation in "ſubmitting my proceedings to the ſtricteſt ſcrutiny, I need not, "at this day, have ſtood before my country, or ſet my life upon "the iſſue of a legal trial. Supported by the conſciouſneſs of "my integrity, I have forced that tranſaction to light, which "might elſe have been ſuppreſſed; and I have voluntarily "ſought that impriſonment, which guilt never invites, and even "innocence has been known to fly from; ardently looking for-"ward to this hour, as the ſure, though painful means, of vindi-"cating a character, not diſtinguiſhed indeed for its importance, "but hitherto maintained, without a blemiſh." [See the whole of this very able defence in the Gent. Mag. 1775. p. 280—83.]

(r) The other candidates were, the Honourable Henry Seymour Conway, the Honourable Hugh Skeffington, and John O'Neil.

" ters," ſays my intelligent correſpondent at Dublin, " are known to have contributed to the raiſing " of that wild clamour, which carried Wilſon's " election by an enthuſiaſtic blaſt of momentary " madneſs." Yet, whatever engagements were required by the patriotic electors, or promiſes were made by the *conſtitutional candidate*, they were ſoon expoſed by parliamentary experience: In two, or three, ſeſſions, Wilſon's *patriotiſm* was ſoftened into compliance, by a place, in the revenue, of two or three hundred pounds a year; which, for aught that appears, he enjoys to this day. There are ſo many examples of patriotic tergiverſation, that this example was not wanted, to teach moderation to the vehement, at popular elections, and circumſpection to the credulous.

The mind of our *Freeholder* of *Antrim* is ſtrongly impregnated with the very eſſence of *Junius:* He has his flowery ſtyle, his dexterous ſophiſtry, and his anarchical violence. The principle, and indeed, the pen, of the myſterious *Junius* are diſcernible, by an attentive eye, in the preface, and, I was going to ſay, in every paragraph, of our Freeholder *(s)*.

The

The laſt, who repreſented, as his name implies, the ancient kings of the *Ultonian Regions*, declined the conteſt: This is the ſame Lord O'Neil, who was, lately, ſlain by the Antrim rebels.

(s) Junius begins his dedication to the *Engliſh nation*, by ſaying, " I dedicate to you a collection of letters written by *one of* " *yourſelves*:" The *Freeholder* ſays, in his *firſt* letter, " It is indiſ- " penſably ours; for, "' the fee ſimple is in us:"' Permit, there- " fore, *one of yourſelves*, to ſubmit his thoughts." Not only are the expreſſions transferred from *Junius* to the *Freeholder*, but the topicks

The first letter of the Freeholder is dated on the 5th of February; and the last, on the 9th of April, 1776. His first *motto* is the well known Jacobinical principle of *Junius*: "They are the trustees, not the

topicks of both are exactly the same: In both, the writer is studious to insult Scotland, and the Scots: In both, he speaks contemptuously of the *pedant*, James: In both, he talks indignantly of the *Scotch historian* [Hume.] He delights, in both, to ridicule the *blushing* Rigby. In *Junius*, he reviles Mr. Horne, as a solitary *monk*: In the *Freeholder*, he reviles Dean Tucker, as the *priest* of Gloster: Now, he had his education among *monks* and *priests*. Junius insisted on the constitutional right to the *pressing of seamen*. [Lett. ix.] The Freeholder equally repeats the same doctrine "of the King's right to press a particular description of his sub-"jects into the sea service." [Pref. xii.] Junius recommends to the English nation the example of the city of London [Lett. xxxvii.]: The Freeholder recommends to the electors of Antrim the example of the city of London. [Let. xi.] In *Junius*, he says, "the people of Ireland have been, uniformly, plundered and op-"pressed." In the Freeholder, he insists, "The spirit of despotism "is gone forth; oppression her object, devastation her means, fa-"mine, sword, and fire, her instruments." [Pref. x.] Junius is the patron of the *colonies*: In the *Freeholder*, the same writer is their *apologist*. [Pref. xi.] The author transplants his own *flowers*, delicate as they are, from his *Junius* to his *Freeholder*: Junius begins his Lett. lxix, by saying, "I turn with pleasure from that "barren waste, in which no salutary plant takes root, *no verdure* "*quickens*, to a character fertile, &c.: The Freeholder concludes his 5th letter, by saying, "Long enough have our eyes ached over "this barren prospect, where *no verdure of virtue quickens*, no pub-"lic service is seen to blossom." Junius had the policy to be *the depositary of his own secret*, which he resolved should *perish with him*: The Freeholder had the policy to preserve his own secret; saying "My name is unknown, and I hope it will remain so." [Lett. 1st.] Such are the coincidences, between *Junius* and the *Antrim Freeholder*, which will convince all those, who read for information, that the same energetic, and elegant, pen wrote both.

"owners of the eſtate. The fee-ſimple is in US." Theobald Wolfe Tone could not have gone beyond this! The Freeholder ſets out, in the following manner: "The great writer, whoſe words I have placed "at the head of my paper, is juſtly acknowledged "to excel, in ſplendour of imagery, and in ſtrength "of diction. But his excellence extends to points ſtill "more important. No writer has inveſtigated with "ſuch ſagacity, nor with ſuch clearneſs pointed out, "the true nature of our admirable conſtitution. The "wiſdom, and learning of Locke had aſcertained ſome "great fundamental maxims, which conſtituted or at "leaſt contributed to form the baſis of our liberties. "But, it remained for the ſucceeding addreſs, and "eloquence of *Junius*, to encounter and to ſubdue, at "leaſt, in the fields of argument, the more refined "corruptions of latter times." Here, then, is the father fondling his child, in a place, where he ſuppoſed himſelf to be unknown, and at a time, when the filiation could not eaſily be ſuſpected: The *Antrim Freeholder* was, actually, called, throughout the ample circulation of the Belfaſt newſpapers, a *ſecond Junius*. To this honourable diſtinction, our *Freeholder* was well entitled. Of the *ſplendour of imagery, and ſtrength of diction*, which are ſo emphatically claimed by the ſon, for the father, there is nothing more ſtriking, nor more appropriate, in the *real Junius*, than the ſubjoined paragraph, from the *firſt Freeholder*: "We are "no longer ſunk in the dead repoſe of deſpotiſm, "and long parliaments. Thoſe ſtagnations of corruption and filth, ſhall no more poiſon the land. "Alba "nautis ſtella refulſit." "The returning day-ſtar of

"the

"the conſtitution again illuminates the political he-
"miſpere; and, in fulneſs of ſplendour, diſplays the
"glorious moment, which reſtores to us our original
"rights. The power, which we delegated, and the
"truſt, which we conferred, revert to us. The con-
"ſtitution regenerates. And the new birth inſpires
"new vigour. As the giant received renovation of
"ſtrength from touching his mother earth, ſo the
"rights of the people acquire new ſpring and force,
"when brought back to their original and parent-
"ſource, the people's voice."—The Freeholder's Let-
ters, which are thus remarkable, for their artifice,
their elegance, and their energy, were ſoon repub-
liſhed at Belfaſt, by Wilſon's committee, in a ſmall
pamphlet, which I have ſeen, without the names,
either of the bookſeller, or the printer *(t)*.

From Belfaſt, our patriotic Freeholder went to Dub-
lin, where he was called to the bar, in Eaſter-term
1776, by the name of Hugh Boyd *(u)*. We may
hereby ſee how facts confirm each other: The fact,
that Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd wrote the *Freeholder* at
Belfaſt, in February, and March, 1776, goes to prove,
that the ſame Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd was called to the
bar at Dublin, in Eaſter term 1776: And, the fact,
that Hugh Boyd was then, and there, called to the
bar, ſtrongly corroborates, by its coincidence, that

(t) I have now, in my poſſeſſion, a copy of it, which was printed in 1776, by M. Mills, No. 135, Capel-ſtreet, Dublin.

(u) Wilſon's Dublin Directory, p. 117: This fact is certain; as I have been aſſured by two very eminent members of the Iriſh bar.

Hugh M'Aulay Boyd wrote the *Antrim Freeholder*. His embarraſſments forced him to put on the gown, while his diſſipation induced him to caſt it off, as an incumbrance to his purſuits: And, he ſoon returned to London, which had attractions for him, that were too powerful for his intereſt, and too ſeductive for his happineſs. We have, in M'Aulay Boyd, the example of a man, who, with every material quality in him of a great lawyer, facility of apprehenſion, ſtrength of intellect, retentiveneſs of memory, confidence of addreſs, could only buſy himſelf, in writing anarchical eſſays, although he was goaded by diſtreſs, and aſſailed by the cries of a family.

We may, naturally, ſuppoſe, that, from Dublin, he returned to his old haunts, and habits, in London. How he was, particularly, employed, during the years 1777, and 1778, I am unable to tell: But, it is certain, that he once more began to write ſeditious papers, which commenced in November 1779, and ended in March 1780 *(x)*. The *London Courant* was the vehicle of thoſe papers, which were entitled *The* WHIG. He, who reads *The Whig*, with attention, will eaſily perceive the pencil of *Junius*, and acknowledge the pen of *the Freeholder*: He will ſee in it, the ſame principles of anarchy, the ſame topicks of turbulence, the ſame dexterities of ſophiſtry, and the ſame characteriſtics of ſtyle; its inaccuracies, its figures, its declamation, and its vigour *(y)*. Yet, *the Whig* did not

(x) Almon's Appendix to his Pol. Anecdotes, p. 1—36.

(y) Take as an example, from the ſame book, p. 24, the following paſſage, at a venture; "The Septennial act of ſuicide, abhor-

"rent

not *elevate, and ſurprize*, like *Junius*. There was no Sir William Draper, ſays Almon, to write *the Whig* into notice. The truth, however, is, that *Junius* was at once *political*, and *perſonal*; *the Whig* was chiefly *political*. The nation, which had been ſtunned with ſuch noiſe, now began to be tired of turbulence, and to loath licentiouſneſs.

At length, a new proſpect opened on M'Aulay Boyd, who now turned his eyes, and his efforts, from the ſeditiouſneſs of the Weſt, to the opulence of the Eaſt. By the influence of "Mr. Laurence Sullivan, "who ſo often filled the chair at the India-houſe,"

"rent certainly from the popular nature of parliament, and deſtruc-
"tive of its due independence, on the crown, had been long perpe-
"trated. Military power and civil influence united to enable the
"prince, if he were ſo diſpoſed by nature or education, to oppreſs
"and corrupt the people, whoſe property and power was [were]
"leſſened, exactly in the proportion that the crown had gained
"weight and force, by the eſtabliſhment of a ſtanding army and a
"national debt. But, above all, the time of his aſcenſion to the
"throne was full of ſuch peculiar circumſtances of popularity, as
"gave him unlimited, becauſe unſuſpected, power. Into that au-
"ſpicious moment was crouded all the promiſe of his youth;
"founded in the fond memory of all the virtues of his anceſtors;
"of his youth, riſing, as it ſeemed, to renew the race of glory
"that they had run, even up to the recent goal of univerſal con-
"queſt. Nature and fortune conſpired to give the young mo-
"narch of that day an empire the beſt and moſt permanent that
"monarchs can enjoy, if they wiſh to maintain it, an abſolute
"power in the hearts of his ſubjects. Such *was* [were] the
"power *and* the opportunity of exerciſing it, with which his pre-
"ſent Majeſty aſcended the throne. If it had been the counſel of
"his reign to improve it into the perfect and reciprocal happi-
"neſs of himſelf and his people, the way was not ſteep nor diffi-
"cult."

our Whig was allowed to go out to Madras, "in Lord "Macartney's ſuite *(z)*," although not *as a covenanted ſervant*. Neither he, who aſked, nor they, who granted, this permiſſion, were probably conſcious how much ſervice they did to *the ſtate*, when they permitted the emigration of a political writer of active exertions, and powerful energy. Whether he had written *Junius*, the *Antrim Freeholder*, or *the Whig*, having never inquired, they did not know. Amid his preparations for departure, with few fears, and many hopes, our emigrant *deſtroyed all his political papers*.

M'Aulay-Boyd arrived at Madras early in 1781. He now "devoted his leiſure hours very ſedulouſly to "the ſtudy of Oriental politics *(a)*. The time ſoon arrived, when his talents of inſinuation, and addreſs, and his knowledge of *oriental politics*, were brought into action. In January 1782, he arrived with Sir Edward Hughes, on board the *Superbe*, at Trincomalee. The fort was hardly taken, when he was diſpatched on an embaſſy to the *King* of CANDY. He was not ſucceſsful, as a negociator. At the end of two months, he returned to Trincomalee, where he unluckily hired a ſmall veſſel to carry him to Madras. He was taken by the French, and carried to the Mauritius; from which place he was ſent to the Iſle of Bourbon. Here, his captivity was alleviated by the hoſpitality of the governor; and, after a while, he was, by the liberality of the ſame officer, allowed to return, on his *parole*, to Madras. He now thought

(z) Life of Boyd, 7—8.

(a) Id.

that

that his ſervices, and misfortunes, entitled him to ſome office, which might compenſate him for both. But, out of nothing nothing comes; and, as there was no vacancy, he could have no place. His diſappointment drove him to Calcutta, where, he, no doubt, hoped to court fortune, in a more propitious mood. In this gay ſcene, his ſocial diſpoſition was welcomed by hoſpitality, which was, in return, enlivened "by the ſuperlative ſprightlineſs of his convi-"vial qualities *(b)*." In the mean time, he was appointed, jointly, with Mr. Corbit, *maſter attendant* at Madras; an office of ſome profit, but of little dignity; and which required his perſonal preſence, where it was to be executed. Thus, was the mighty *Junius*, the *Antrim Freeholder*, the *Independent Whig*, transformed into the harbour-maſter of Madras *(c)*.

The duties of this office "were neither congenial to "the delicacy of his mind, nor his habits of life," ſays his biographer; "but, as the emoluments were great, "he reſolved to ſacrifice a little ſenſibility, for the "proſpect of ultimate wealth." His old habits, in the mean time, induced him to return to his early practices: And, during the Myſore war, he conducted a newspaper, entitled *The Courier (d)*.

It

(b) Life of Boyd, p. 15.

(c) Id.—Such, I was told, at the India-houſe, is the nature of the *maſter attendant's* office, which, ſince that period, has been rented at four thouſand pounds a year: In the end, he enjoyed this office, without the participation of Mr. Corbit; but, without making any remittances.

(d) Ib. p. 16.—I will here ſubjoin a note, which I have received from an intelligent friend, with regard to the management of

It was, in June 1793, that he firſt conceived the idea of publiſhing *periodical eſſays*: It was in Auguſt 1793, that he firſt made known to the public his plan for the *Indian Obſerver*, which he reſolved to publiſh, through the commodious channel of a weekly news-paper: And, the firſt number of this paper, which he entitled *The Hircarrah*, came out on the 9th of September 1793. For theſe eſſays, he appears to have been "honoured with the ſanction of the higher "powers, and favoured with the indulgence of the "[Indian] public." What Johnſon ſaid of *the Connoiſſeur*, and *the World*, that *they wanted matter*, may be properly applied to *the Indian Obſerver*: But, the *Indian Obſerver* is ſuperior to both, in vigour, and elegance *(e)*. The power, and pride, of *Junius* were his *figures*. The *Indian Obſerver* too has his *imagery*. After

of M'Aulay-Boyd, as the conductor of *the Courier*: "It is notorious that the late Hugh Boyd was proprietor, editor, and ſole "conductor of the *Madras Courier*; that his paper was engaged in "many important conteſts, both for, and againſt, the government "of Madras, and Bengal: If Hugh Boyd was the author of *Junius*, "his language may be eaſily diſcovered in the *Madras Courier*; "where, at various times, he was placed in a ſituation, which called "for the utmoſt exertion of all his abilities: For, *he always liked "to fiſh in troubled waters.*"

(e) The *motto* of the *Indian Obſerver*'s firſt number is from *the Rambler*, on *the difficulty of the firſt addreſs*. "If ſuch be the ac-"knowledgement of a great maſter, who to extraordinary force "of mind, united the ample ſtores of learning and knowledge, and "with a ſtrength of ſtyle peculiarly his own, preſented more ſub-"jects to the public eye than perhaps any other author; what muſt "be the feelings of the common claſs of writers?—and, if merely "the firſt addreſs involve ſo much difficulty, how formidable muſt be "the

After noticing how the *Spectator* "looked vice into "ſhame; how "the *Tatler* told every thing to every "body, and told it ſo well, that the hearer was al- "lured to liſten, and delighted to laugh;" how "the *Guardian* watched with anxious attention "againſt miſchief;" he ſhowed how "the WORLD "diſplayed its knowledge, and diffuſed the precept "of its beſt ſcience, in a manner ſo agreeably varied, "as to prove, that the conductors of that literary pla- "net, for its day of influence, were well qualified to "diſcriminate the parallaxes of pleaſure and propriety, "in the ſchool of faſhion; to catch and correct the "fluctuating manners in that changeable ſcene; to "prove, by a happy mixture of the moſt pleaſing with "the moſt uſeful doctrine, that the true orbit of the

"the undertaking, to repeat, at ſtated periods, certain *quantums* of "compoſition; to bind fancy down to punctuality; and to preſent "to the public attention, a periodical eſſay? How arduous ought "the attempt to appear, if they knew themſelves, to thoſe whoſe "literary ambition muſt be conſcious of much unſtudious avocation; "who have omitted to ſupply by obſervation, or even late enquiry, "what perhaps was early neglected in ſtudy, or denied in genius; "to thoſe, in fine, whoſe experience is ſo limited, both of them- "ſelves and the public, that they think they can write, and hope "they will be read. It may be remarked, that theſe difficulties are "more felt by the veteran than the young adventurer; that for- "ward zeal will ruſh, where caution would tremble to tread; and "that the ſuperficial judge boldly plunges into his ſea of trou- "bles; fearleſs, becauſe ignorant, of the dangers of the literary "deep. Although not wholly in the latter deſcription, of abſolute "inexperience, the preſent writer is well aware of his diſtance "from the former. He regards, with a moſt reſpectful eye, the in- "terval between his humble eſſay, and the excellence of periodical "publication, which, for an Auguſtan century, has been the orna- "ment and inſtruction of his country."

"man

" man of pleaſure is within the excentricities of ex-
" travagance; and the ſphere of honour has ever vir-
" tue for its center." This imagery was favourably received, and uſefully felt at Madras: Before the publication of the ſecond *Obſerver*, a hundred ſubſcribers were added to the liſt of encouragers. *The Indian Obſerver* went the length of fifty-three numbers; and was cloſed, on the 16th of September 1794. It was, indeed, time to finiſh it: For, in the fiftieth number of the 19th Auguſt 1794, appeared the cloven foot of M'Aulay, *Junius*, and *the* WHIG; the blunder of the one; the inaccuracy of the other; and the ſeditiouſneſs of all: " An obſerver of the great events
" of the world," ſays the *Indian Obſerver*, " muſt be
" more ſtruck with the extraordinary conteſt, which
" agitates not only the nations of Europe, but ex-
" tends its commotion to the other quarters of the
" globe, than with any ſcene preſented in the annals
" of hiſtory; whether it be conſidered, as to its conſe-
" quences, or in its principles. In the conſequences, are
" [is] involved the happineſs of mankind; the *ſacred*
" *principles*, by *which it is actuated*, are *liberty*, and the
" *rights of man*." The *Indian Obſerver* had properly engaged, that " *this paper* ſhould *not mix* in political
" queſtions:" Yet, M'Aulay, with his uſual ſpirit, introduced, on the ſcene, the *rights of man*; his ungrammatical ſubſtitution of *are* for *is* may be conſidered as characteriſtic of *his Junius*; and his exhibition of the French revolution, with its " *ſacred prin-*
" *ciples*," to the ſervants of the India company, was altogether worthy of *his Whig*.

The foregoing ſentiments of *the Indian Obſerver* were

introductory to "The *ſpeech* of GALGACUS, to his army on *the Grampian hills*, from Murphy's *Tranſlation* of *Tacitus*." That either M'Aulay, or Murphy, ſhould have conſidered the declamation of Tacitus, as the ſpeech of *Galgac*, the Caledonian chief, is a proof how much the moſt vigorous minds may be warped by prejudice. Yes: The ſpeech of Galgac had been printed by *Raban*, who had introduced printing at Aberdeen, a town, which lay in the rear of the Caledonian army; and the ſpeech, thus printed, in the Caledonian language, was diſperſed among the Caledonian tribes, in the true French mode, to inflame them with a love of French liberty, and to encourage them to defend *the rights of man*, which were vaſtly well underſtood, in that age. Whether that celebrated oration were delivered, in the *Britiſh*, or in the *Erſe*, language, we are not told: But, it muſt have been tranſmitted, in whatever language, by Agricola, and tranſlated, no doubt, by Tacitus. The re-tranſlation of Tacitus's *libertates* into Pain's *rights of man*, was deemed very free by Murphy; and the recommendation of French politics, and French principles, in the moſt engaging manner, to the ſervants of the India company, as *Britiſh ſentiments*, in *Britiſh expreſſion*, was perfectly congenial to Junius.

This extraordinary man finiſhed his devious career, on the 19th of October 1794, at Madras, in the moſt embarraſſed circumſtances, after having been abandoned by ſome of his friends *(f)*. The character of M'Aulay Boyd muſt be ſettled from a conſideration of the great outlines of his *life*, and from the ſtrong

(f) Life of Boyd, pa. 15.

evidence

evidence of his undoubted publications, rather than from the frivolous declamation of biographical fondneſs *(g)*. He left behind him a widow, a woman of accompliſhments, who delights in books; and two children,

(g) I will, however, ſubjoin the following outline of the character of M'Aulay-Boyd, which has been tranſmitted to me, by a very eminent Member of the Iriſh bar, who no longer reſides at Dublin; and who appears to have known this extraordinary perſon, from his cradle to his grave; although my intelligent correſpondent ſeems to give a ſomewhat different point to the ſubject from mine:——"I knew Mr. Boyd from his early life; but the "difference in our ages rendered, for ſeveral years, our intimacy "not ſo perfect, as it afterwards became.—I had quitted ſchool, "the univerſity, and the Temple, ſucceſſively, before him; ſo that, "from my own knowledge, I cannot ſay any thing of his ſtudies, "or attainments; but I have always underſtood, that he diſtinguiſhed himſelf over moſt of his cotemporaries: He was a very "good Greek, and Latin, ſcholar, and was well acquainted with "different branches of the mathematics. He did not, as I believe, "ſtudy our laws, with a view to the profeſſion: He was, it is true, "called to the *Iriſh* bar, but did not continue to practiſe there: "He was never at the *Engliſh* bar. He was fond of what is called "polite literature, and excelled in it. He was not much attached "to other ſtudies. Excepting a periodical paper, which he publiſhed at Madras, under the title of The *Indian Obſerver*, and "ſome light poetical eſſays, of which I have no copies, I was not "acquainted with any of his productions, in proſe, or verſe; and "I am much inclined to believe, he did not engage in any ſerious "work, in either: I was in the habits of intimate correſpondence "with him, for many years, before his death, and I never had any "reaſon to think he did. He had very pleaſing manners; and "though he often took the lead in converſation, it was generally "with the conſent of the company: He was fond of argument, but "never overbearing: He excelled in lively ſallies, but ſcarce ever "introduced ſerious ſubjects, moral, or political: His talents, and "attainments, did not ſeem to lead him to either. He firſt came "to Madras, as aſſiſtant ſecretary: Sir George Staunton was ſecretary to Lord Macartney. Soon after his arrival, there, he was ſent

"to

children, a boy, and a girl: The ſon, who was born after his father's departure to the eaſt, poſſeſſes his genius, with greater application; and, with his forwardneſs, has already produced a tragedy.

I now proceed to prove, affirmatively, who did write Junius's letters. Some readers may, perhaps, be already ſatisfied, from the foregoing intimations, that my original opinion was right. There are perſons, however, who will not eaſily be perſuaded to adopt a truth, which can only be eſtabliſhed by circumſtantial proofs; without conſidering the judgements of thoſe able men, who regard the evidence of circumſtances, as the ſtrongeſt; becauſe human teſtimony is ſo extremely fallible.

It

" to Ceylon, on ſome negociation, with the king of Candy; the " particulars of this have never been publiſhed: His papers, it is " ſaid, were loſt, when, on his attempting to return to Madras, he " was taken by a French frigate, and carried to Mauritius: He " did, however, return to Madras, before Lord Macartney quitted " that government; and was by him appointed to a very lucrative " employment, *joint maſter attendant* with a Mr. Corbitt: He after- " wards became ſole maſter attendant, and enjoyed the office until " his death. His being at Calcutta was only to pay occaſional " viſits to his friend Sir John Macpherſon. On the particular ſub- " ject, which, from our friend's letter, I learn you mean to inveſti- " gate, I can give no particular information: That Mr. Boyd was " not the author of Junius, I will not preſume to aſſert, but from " comparing the time thoſe celebrated letters were written with " the time he came to England, it will appear very extraordi- " nary, that he could have obtained ſo much, and ſo various, know- " ledge of the political drama, there exhibited, and of the *dramatis* " *perſonæ*, as are there diſplayed."——I am, moreover, informed, obligingly, by the Rev. Dr. George Hall, of Trinity College, Dublin, " that Mr. M^c^Aulay-Boyd commenced Batchelor of Arts, " in this Univerſity, on the 19th of February 1765; and never " was admitted to any other degree."

It was in January 1769, that "Junius burſt into "notice with a blaze of impudence," ſays Johnſon, "which has rarely glared upon the world before." Junius, though he had provided for his ſafety, by impenetrable ſecrecy, was immediately encountered by Sir William Draper, who did not wield unequal arms: But, his infelicity, and his comparative feebleneſs, conſiſted, in his being a known character; whilſt Junius ſtrengthened himſelf with the immunities of inviſibility. Sir William returned often to the charge; although repulſed by Junius. Sir William was not overpowered by the artillery of learning, wit, and argument, in which he was quite equal to his antagoniſt; but, he was foiled by recrimination, which was a common, and a forcible, weapon, in the hands of Junius. Sir William, as a ſcholar, had been bred at Eton, and King's college, Cambridge; but, he choſe the ſword, for his profeſſion. In India, he ranked with thoſe famous warriors, Clive, and Laurence. In 1761, he acted at Belliſle, as a Brigadier. In 1763, he commanded the troops, who conquered Manilla, which place was ſaved from plunder, by the promiſe of a ranſom, that was never paid. His firſt appearance, as an able writer, was in his clear refutation of the objections of the Spaniſh court *(b)*. His ſervices were rewarded with the command of the ſixteenth regiment of foot, which he reſigned to Colonel Gilborne, for his half-pay of £.1200 Iriſh: This common tranſaction furniſhed Junius with many a ſarcaſm. Sir William had ſcarcely cloſed his conteſt with that formidable

(b) Gent. Mag. Vol. XXXIV. p. 590.

opponent,

opponent, when he had the misfortune to loſe his wife; who died, on the 1ſt of September 1769. As he was foiled, he was, no doubt, mortified. And he ſet out, in October of that year, to make the tour of the Northern Colonies, which had now become objects of notice, and ſcenes of travel. He arrived at Charles-town, South Carolina, in January 1770; and, travelling northward, he arrived, during the ſummer of that year, in Maryland; where he was received with that hoſpitality, which ſhe always paid to ſtrangers, and with the attentions, that were due to the merit of ſuch a viſiter. It was at Mount-Clare, the villa of Charles Carrol, near Baltimore-town, where Sir William was kindly entertained, in company with the Governor, and other perſons of diſtinction: And, in this company, was held a converſation, which, as it, pointedly, bears upon the preſent ſubject, merits minute attention *(i)*. From Maryland,

(i) This converſation has been ſtated to me, in a letter from an ingenious friend, who was preſent; and for whoſe preciſion, and probity, I will be anſwerable: His letter is as follows:

"Dear Sir,

"I remember Sir William Draper, when he viſited America, "in the ſummer 1770. He paſſed through Baltimore: Dining in "company with him at a gentleman's houſe, where many were "preſent; the converſation after dinner turned upon the ſubject of "Junius's letters, to which I gave attention; as Sir William Draper "was preſent. On a gentleman's aſking Sir William Draper, "whether Mr. Burke was not ſuſpected of being the author, Sir "William replied, that he did, at firſt, ſuſpect Mr. Burke, from "his attachmenr to that party, whoſe principles were ſupported by "Junius; Sir William ſaid, before he left England, he acquitted "Mr. Burke; for, on ſpeaking to him, Mr. Burke aſſured him he "was not the author."

Maryland, Sir William paſſed on to New York, where he married Miſs De Lancy, a lady of great connections there, and agreeable endowments, who died, in 1778; leaving him a daughter. In 1779, he was appointed Lieutenant-governor of Minorca; a truſt, which, however diſcharged, ended unhappily. He died, at Bath, on the 8th of January 1787 *(k)*.

" Sir William added, that early in the diſpute he, and his friends, " had taken great pains to aſcertain the author, and that direct ap- " plication was made, for that purpoſe, to the printer, whether by " Sir William, or a friend I did not underſtand;—that Mr. Woodfall " the printer anſwered, his paper was an open one, and he was, " and had been, as ready to publiſh Sir William Draper's letters, " as thoſe of Junius;—that if he did know the author, who " wrote under the ſignature of Junius, he would not give up his " name; and further ſaid, that the letters came to him in a ſuch " manner, that he did not enquire after, or know the writer, at that " time.—A gentleman obſerving, that whoever was the author, " was certainly well acquainted with political characters, and the " ſtate of parties, at that period; Sir William ſaid, he certainly " was; and a very formidable antagoniſt to encounter in a public " diſcuſſion: That he was a man who muſt move in the higheſt " circles, as his information appeared to be drawn from ſources, to " which none but a man of high birth, and character, or one that " has filled an office of conſequence in the government, could have " had acceſs to.

" A gentleman ſaying, that the public were obliged to Junius for " bringing forward Sir William Draper's letters, as he, Sir William, " had loſt nothing by the conteſt; Sir William politely thanked " him for the compliment, and added, that he wrote for the ſake " of truth, and to vindicate the character of a friend. Before the " converſation cloſed, a gentleman ſaid, you, certainly, Sir William, " in acquitting Mr. Burke, muſt have ſuſpected ſome other perſon;— " Sir William replied, he had ſome ſuſpicion of Lord George " Sackville."

**************".

(k) An. Reg.—Gent. Mag. 1787. p. 91.

We

We have thus learned, from the converſation of Sir William Draper, on whom the ſuſpicions fell, with regard to the writing of Junius, during the ſummer of 1770. He acquitted Edmund Burke; and he had, of Lord George Sackville, ſome ſuſpicion, which we now know to have been unfounded. That the letters of Junius were written by a perſon, "who moved in the higheſt circles," we, moreover, know to be very problematical. Boyd moved in circles, whence he derived his whole information; except what he had, copiouſly, gleaned from the printed pamphlets, which, at that period, greatly abounded. Among a thouſand perſons, whom he knew, and to whom he was known, Boyd was intimately connected with Lauchlan M'Lean, who had been Under Secretary of State, from 1766, to 1768. The truth, however, is, as I have already intimated, that there is no other *official* information in *Junius*, than could have been collected from the *Red-book*, and the *Army Liſt*, by a perſon, who knew how to enlarge what was deficient, and to curtail what was ſuperfluous. Had Sir William Draper given his opinion of *Junius*, after his formidable antagoniſt had been foiled by Mr. Horne, and had debaſed his pretenſions to greatneſs, by engaging, unſucceſsfully, in city politics, and mingling, factiouſly, with the Supporters of the Bill of Rights, he would no otherwiſe have regarded *Junius*, than as the *meteor, which had plunged its followers in a bog.*

That the writer of *Junius* was a frequent attendant in both Houſes of Parliament is ſufficiently apparent from internal evidence *(l)*. But, Boyd is known to

(l) The Preface to the gen. ed. xviii.: *Junius* often quotes parliamentary ſpeeches, as taken by himſelf. Ib. vol. ii. p. 69.

have been a more aſſiduous attendant upon the debates in Parliament, than upon the cauſes in Weſtminſter-hall; to have oftener repeated parliamentary ſpeeches, than to have reported juridical caſes.

The letters of *Junius* were not written by an *Engliſhman*; becauſe an Engliſh ſcholar would not have written *elder*, for *eldeſt*, nor confounded *have* with *hath*, nor have ſubſtituted *collegian*, for the fellow of a college. Theſe obvious inaccuracies are mere *Scoto-Iriciſms*: And, Boyd was, undoubtedly, an Iriſhman, of the Ultonian race, who, like ſome of his countrymen, hated the people, and the country, whence they had derived their recent origin *(m)*, at the re-ſettlement of Ulſter.

It

(m) An ingenious friend has informed me, that in 1769, he publiſhed, in the Gazetteer, an eſſay, ſigned MODESTUS, in order to determine a wager, whether *Junius* were an *Iriſhman*: It was previouſly agreed, that if *Junius* ſhould notice this eſſay, on the charge of his being an Iriſhman, the wager ſhould be won; if Junius ſhould paſs by MODESTUS, in ſilence, the wager ſhould be loſt; the parties agreeing, that his *crying out* would imply conſciouſneſs of his Iriſh birth; and that his *ſilence* would ſhow his unconcern about the imputation. On the 19th of October 1769, *Philo-Junius*, that is *Junius*, formally anſwered *Modeſtus*, who had acutely ſaid, that neither an Engliſhman, nor a Scotſman, and none but an Iriſhman would have made Sir William Draper *repoſe* on a *bed of torture*. Philo-Junius exclaimed; "But, why muſt Junius "be an Iriſhman? MODESTUS cannot diſtinguiſh between a *ſarcaſm* "and a *contradiction*." [Let 29. gen. ed. vol. i. p. 201.] *Modeſtus* had an obvious reply, that a *ſarcaſm*, which involves a *blunder*, may be a *contradiction*, but not a true *ſarcaſm*, except on the writer of *blundering ſarcaſms*. In the preface to the genuine, corrected, edition of Junius's Letters, p. xxvi. we have the following paſſage: "I am far from meaning to impeach the articles of the union. If "the true ſpirit of thoſe articles were adhered to, we ſhould not "ſee Engliſh peerages given to Scotch ladies, or [nor] to the *elder*

"ſons

§

It muſt be apparent to every diſcerning eye, as it was to the caſual inſpection of Mr. Wilkes, that the epiſtles of *Junius* were written by an *inexperienced* hand, with a *juvenile* quill: Now, M'Aulay-Boyd was not three-and-twenty, when *Junius* firſt appeared. But, is it probable, that ſuch papers could have been writ-

" ſons of Scotch Peers, and the number of ſixteen doubled and " trebled by a ſcandalous evaſion of the act of union." An Engliſh writer would not have uſed *elder*, for *eldeſt*; becauſe the Engliſh language does not admit of a *comparative* without a correlative: *Elder*, for *eldeſt*, is a Scoticiſm, and a Scoto-Iriciſm. A Scotiſh man would not have written ſuch a paſſage: And, it was, therefore, written by an Iriſhman. Again: In Junius's preface to his edition of 1771, before mentioned, p. xii, there is the following paſſage: " Unhappily for this country, the diffidence, diſtruſt, and diviſion, " which thus aroſe between the parties ſo greatly intereſted in, and " deſirous of, promoting the ſame common cauſe, *have* not only pre- " vented their private ſucceſs, but *hath*, at the ſame time, occa- " ſioned the cauſe of the public to miſcarry." An Engliſh writer would not ſubſtitute *hath*, for *have*, which, in this paſſage, is peculiarly blundering; and which is another *Scoticiſm*, or rather *Scoto-Iriciſm*. Junius ſays to Mr. Horne, " I will not deſcend to anſwer " the little ſneering ſophiſtries of a *collegian*;" An Engliſh ſcholar would not have uſed, thus, the word *collegian*, which, I am aſſured, by my intelligent correſpondent at Dublin, is peculiar to the *univerſity*, there: But, the word *collegian* is equally current in the univerſities of Scotland. In December 1769, about ſix weeks after Almon had taxed Boyd with being *Junius*, " Lord Temple aſked " me," ſays Almon, " if I knew the writer of the letters, ſigned " *Junius*: I told his Lordſhip, that I did not; but that I had " my ſuſpicions. His Lordſhip ſaid, he had his ſuſpicions alſo; " but, that they did not go to Mr. Burke: Yet, he had no doubt " of the writer being an *Iriſhman*." [Almon's unpubliſhed Letter to Mr. L. D. Campbell, of the 10th of December 1798.] Now; if thoſe facts, and circumſtances, be allowed to point, with a demonſtrative finger, to the country of *Junius*, the queſtion about his name would be greatly circumſcribed.

ten by ſuch a youth? Yes: Tom Chatterton, a ſtill more extraordinary youth, was, at the ſame time, walking the ſtreets of London, in queſt of bread. He died, on the 25th of Auguſt 1770, when he had not reached his twentieth year. It was a favourite maxim of this extraordinary boy, "that man is "equal to any thing; and that every thing might be "atchieved by diligence, and abſtinence." This obſervation would alone ſhow how intuitively he had penetrated into human nature. He has been likened, by critical enthuſiaſm, as an impoſtor, to Mahomet; and compared, as a poet, to Milton. It is, however, agreed by the greateſt critics, that he was one of the rareſt genius's, which this iſland has ever produced. As *a politician*, Chatterton ſurpaſſed M'Aulay: For, Chatterton wrote, at the ſame moment, both for, and againſt, the government: *(n)* M'Aulay could only write againſt the government. In the inveſtigation of the powers of man, is it, then, improbable to ſay,

(n) On the 26th of May 1770, Chatterton addreſſed a Letter to Lord North, ſigned MODERATOR; which began: "My Lord; it gives me a painful pleaſure;" and contained an *encomium* on the Adminiſtration, for rejecting the City Remonſtrance: On the ſame day, Chatterton wrote a Letter to the Lord Mayor, Beckford, ſigned PROBUS; which contained a virulent invective againſt the Government, for rejecting the Remonſtrance; beginning, "When the endeavours of a ſpirited people to free themſelves "from inſupportable ſlavery," &c. [Gregory's Life of Chatterton, p. 88.] In Chatterton's CONSULIAD, a ſatirical poem, may be ſeen, in his Miſcell. p. 92, the following paſſage:—

"Inflated DISCORD heard, and left her cell,
"With all the horrors of her native hell:
"She, on the ſoaring wings of genius fled,
"And waved the pen of JUNIUS round her head."

that

that if ſuch a boy, as Chatterton, could write what has been deemed equal to the firſt productions of the greateſt writers, that ſuch a youth as M'Aulay, who, undoubtedly, wrote what few can write, was unequal to the compoſition of *Junius?* Of Chatterton, it was obſerved by Bryant, that with all his powers, he could not write *grammatically:* But, did it require the erudition of Bryant to diſcover, that between natural genius, and artificial learning, wide is the difference? This obſervation is alone ſufficient to illuſtrate the ſcholaſtic character of *Junius:* He had uncommon genius; but, he wanted grammatical knowledge *(o)*. Wilkes ſhrewdly ſaid, that the writer wanted *expe-*

(o) Bryant was led to make his philological remark before mentioned, by ſeeing, in Chatterton, *more better:* I was induced to obſerve, in my *Supplemental Apology*, that *Junius could not write common Engliſh, with grammatical propriety*, by ſeeing, every where, in his pages, the groſſeſt blunders. I would engage to point out in the genuine and *corrected* edition of *Junius*, ſome blunder, in almoſt every page of him. Take, as examples, the following: "The form *and* magnitude of a quarto impoſes," [impoſe, 1 v. p. 142.] "Is candid to [an] extreme." [Ib. 152.] "Apparent meaning *and* intention as *it* ſtands," [as *they ſtand.* Ib. 153.] "Lord [Lords] Gower, Weymouth, and Sandwich." [Ib. 174.] "Precedents enough," [Ib. 174.] *enow*, ſays Johnſon, is the *plural* of *enough.* "If he judges; If he admits," [every where.] "A [an] uſeful act." [Ib. 325.] "An *appear-*" *ance* of morals *and* religion *are* [is] uſeful." [Ib. 305.] "*Nei-*" *ther were*" [was. Ib. 306.] "When the force *and* direction of "perſonal ſatire *is* [are] no longer felt." [Dedication, ii.] "They "are the truſtees, not the owners of the eſtate. The fee ſimple is "in us. They cannot alienate, they cannot waſte" [it.] [Ib. v.] We may ſee *is*, for *are*, in vol. 2. p. 1. There is *have*, for *has.* [Ib. 11.]

rience: I accidentally ſaid, that the author wanted *age.*

It appears, moreover, from every page of JUNIUS, that he delighted *to fiſh in troubled waters*; watching every accident, and ſeizing every opportunity; intermeddling with the court, and the city; intriguing with Wilkes, and with the Supporters of the Bill of Rights. Now; M'Aulay was a *fiſher in troubled waters:* He was always "buſtling about ſomething or "another *(p)*:" He fiſhed in troubled waters, when he *took infinite pains to perſuade the world of the innocence of the Perreaus.* He fiſhed in troubled waters, when he wrote his *Antrim Letters:* And he fiſhed in troubled waters at Madras.

M'Aulay was a noted writer in magazines, and news-papers, and was a well-known reporter of parliamentary ſpeeches. Junius ſays himſelf, "I cannot "recal to my memory the numerous trifles I have "written *(q)*. And, he frequently refers, in his notes, to the ſpeeches he had heard in parliament; at the ſame time, repeating paſſages of what he had carried away *(r)*.

In his vigour, and activity, Junius may be compared to a race-horſe, which ſeems to outſtrip the wind, by his energy, and his ſpeed, without any ſimilarity to the dray-horſe, which performs innumerable ſervices, by his perſevering labour, and his overpower-

(p) His editor ſays [Life, p. 20.] "he paſſed through a chec-"quered, and *buſtling*, life."

(q) Gen. Ed. vol. 2. p. 230.

(r) Pref. xviii. vol. 2. p. 69, &c.

ing

ing force. "I was not born," says Junius, "to be a "commentator, even upon my own works *(s)*." Of his letters, he says *(t)*, "to me they originally owe no-"thing, but a healthy, sanguine constitution." These are *traits of character*, which are, minutely, descriptive of M'Aulay, who was, from nature, of *a healthy sanguine constitution*; who had great activity of intellect, and readiness of hand; but had neither persevering labour, nor overpowering execution: He wrote essays, and speeches; but, he could not compose, nor translate, a book of any size *(u)*: And, he wanted application, for the practice of the law; or indeed, for any serious employment.

In *his Anecdotes* of *the Author*, Junius speaks, contemptuously, of the *favourite history* of England, which was written by "*a Scotch philosopher*, who was a perfect "stranger to the idiom of the English tongue *(x)*." M'Aulay, in his *Antrim Letters*, speaks, indignantly,

(s) Pref. xii.

(t) Dedica. i.

(u) "In February 1794," says his Editor, "Mr. Boyd adver-"tised proposals for publishing by subscription his Embassy to "Candy [in 1782.] The tardiness of the public damped the ar-"dour, with which he had embraced the project; and he delayed "taking up his pen, until a sufficient sum was subscribed, to bear "the charges of the press." [Life of Boyd, p. 18.] But, in September, he resolved to begin, adds his Editor, what ought to have been finished a dozen years before. He trusted to his retentive memory, for the interesting matter, which was to fill two 8vo. volumes. This, then, is incontrovertible proof, that M'Aulay-Boyd was incapable of writing a book, which required persevering effort.

(x) The Pref, Anecdotes of Junius to the Edit. 1771, p. xvii.

of

of "*the Scotch hiſtorian*, who had violated the manes "of John Hampden, in his pretended Hiſtory of "England, which ſhould be really called an Apology "for the houſe of Stuart." In the *Antrim Freeholder*, there are a thouſand coincidences, which prove, that the writer of it was alſo the writer of Junius's letters *(y)*. Such are the reſemblances, which form an indiſſoluble bond of connection between Junius and M'Aulay-Boyd!

I will now proceed to tye the knot tighter. Boyd was in the habit of frequenting the ſhop of Almon, who detected him, as the writer of Junius, as early as the autumn of 1769. At a meeting of the booksellers, and printers, H. S. Woodfall read a letter of Junius, which he had juſt received, becauſe it contained a paſſage, that related to the buſineſs of the meeting. Almon had thereby an opportunity of ſeeing the hand-writing of the manuſcript, without diſcloſing his thoughts of the diſcovery. The next time that Boyd called on him in Piccadilly, Almon ſaid to him, "I "have ſeen a part of one of Junius's Letters, in manu-"ſcript, which I believe is your hand-writing." (*Boyd inſtantly changed colour*; and after a ſhort pauſe, he ſaid, "the ſimilitude of hand-writing is not a conclu-"ſive fact *(z)*," [proof.] Now; Almon does not deliver theſe intimations, as mere opinions; but, he ſpeaks, like a witneſs, to facts, which he knows to be true. It is a fact, then, that Almon taxed Boyd with being the writer of Junius's Letters; that *Boyd there-*

(y) See before, p. 66.

(z) Mr. Almon's Letter to Mr. L. D. Campbell, dated the 30th December 1798, which remains in MS. unpubliſhed.

upon

upon changed colour; and that he only turned off the imputation, by the obvious remark, that compariſon of hand-writing is not deciſive evidence, to prove the writer. Add to this teſtimony, that Boyd was, by nature, *confident*, and, by habit, *a man of the town*, a ſort of character, who is not apt to bluſh. From the epoch of this detection, it was the practice of Almon, when he was aſked, who was the writer of *Junius*, to ſay, "that he ſuſpected Junius was a broken gentle-"man, without a guinea in his pocket."

Again: When Almon came to be proſecuted for the republication of Junius's Letter to the King, during the year 1770, he remarked what confirmed, ſtrongly, his previous ſuſpicions: "During the whole time, "that this proſecution was going on," ſays Almon, "Mr. Boyd never once called upon me; which I "could not help obſerving; becauſe before that time, "he commonly called twice or thrice a week; and I "thought it not leſs remarkable, that after the proſe-"cution was totally at an end, he reſumed his former "cuſtom *(a)*." Here, then, is proof of another fact, which goes far towards *aſcertaining Boyd to be Junius:* For, the former bluſhes of Boyd were an involuntary confeſſion of his guilt: And, the above conduct was a virtual acknowledgement of his own apprehenſions, recollecting the paſt detection, and fearing the preſent inquiries.

To the foregoing proofs, which have already ſatis-

(a) Id.—The dates of Junius's Letters demonſtrate, that the writer of them ſkulked, during the proſecutions againſt the publiſhers of them: Now, this demonſtration confirms the ſhrewd remark of Almon.

fied

fied fair inquirers about a curious truth, I will add another fact, which is equally decisive. "The wife "of Boyd often suspected him, from what she saw, "and heard, of being the author of Junius; but when "she mentioned her suspicions to him, he only smil-"ed." He had resolved, it seems, "to be the *sole de-"positary* of his own secret, which he also determined "should perish with him *(b)*." He knew intuitively, that a secret, entrusted to many, or even to a wife, can seldom be kept. Yet; is it stated, as a fact, "that when Mr. Boyd was at home, with his family, "he used to shew at all times an uncommon degree "of interest about the Letters of *Junius*; and with "the confidential relation above-mentioned [his wife] "he often sought a *tête-à-tête* conversation upon them, "seeming pleased at the remarks, which were made, "whether of censure, or praise. With his other "friends, he was sometimes indifferent, and frequently "close, on the subject of *Junius*. He was a zealous "advocate for the political principles, which those "letters contain; but was slow in bestowing praise "on their literary merits, and occasionally objected to "the boldness of some particular passages." Other persons were studious, to disavow the knowledge of those letters. Boyd was forward to shew his interest in them; to seek conversations about them; and to advocate their principles, malignant, and anarchical, as they were *(c)*.

Of

(b) Dedication, p. ii.

(c) I have likewise *impartial* evidence, to prove, that M'Aulay-Boyd was forward to shew an interest about the letters of *Junius*. —Moreover, my very intelligent correspondent, at Dublin, has also

Of a point, which is, ſufficiently, clear, ſome additional evidence may be obtained, by inquiring, when this myſtery was firſt revealed. In the *General Advertiſer* of the 15th of April, 1786, there appeared a paragraph to the following effect: "When Lord Ma-"cartney went to Madras, *it is well known*, that "JUNIUS *went with him: He is a native of Ireland*, "and received his education, in the college of Dub-"lin." The name of Boyd, indeed, was not mentioned, in the foregoing paragraph: But, he was deſcribed by his qualities; as *Junius* had, before deſcribed Burke, in his prefatory anecdotes. Mrs. Boyd, who then reſided at Hampſtead, ſent a gentleman, on the ſame morning, that the paragraph appeared, to the printer, with a requeſt, "that no more paragraphs, "alluding to *Mr. Boyd*, might appear, in the paper, "becauſe ſhe feared, that ſuch information might "eſſentially injure Mr. Boyd's intereſt in India *(d)*." As neither Mrs. Boyd, nor Mr. Almon, ſent that paragraph to the *General Advertiſer*, in April, 1786, it follows, from the fact, that ſome other perſon ſtrongly ſuſpected Boyd to be the writer of Junius, as well as Mr. Almon, and Mrs. Boyd. I do not know, that this ſubject was again brought before the public,

alſo ſtated to me two very important facts: "There is no evidence, "in the family [in Ireland,] that *Boyd* was *Junius*; and yet, it is "remarkable, that *there has been long an habitual notion, among them, "to that effect*: When ſpeaking of *Junius*, on his laſt viſit to Ire-"land, he has been known to ſay, *with confidence*, that *the author "would never be diſcovered*."

(d) Theſe anecdotes we alſo owe to Mr. Almon's unpubliſhed letter before mentioned.

till

till the publication of Almon's *Anecdotes*, in 1797, when Boyd was again deſcribed, but not mentioned, as the writer of *Junius (e)*. In 1798, Mr. L. D. Campbell, the Editor of the *Indian Obſerver*, expreſsly, mentioned Boyd, as the writer of *Junius*; adding, "that before Mr. Boyd went to India, he was ſuſ-"pected by ſome of the bookſellers, as well as his "neareſt connections, to be [the] author of thoſe let-"ters *(f)*." The Editor has collected other circumſtances, for the purpoſe of proving his point; which, to mention here, would not at all ſtrengthen my chain of evidence. In 1799, I affirmed the ſame poſition; ſaying, in my *Supplemental Apology*, that I had ſeen documents, which had convinced me, *that M'Aulay-Boyd was the writer of Junius's Letters*. I have, ſince, reviewed my documents, conſidered his character, and compared his ſeveral writings with each other: And, from this re-examination, I am now induced to ſay, that I regard it, as a *moral certainty*, that M'Aulay-Boyd did write the letters of *Junius*.

Of all the characters, however, who knew Boyd, perſonally, I have only met with one gentleman, who is of opinion, that he was able to write Junius's Letters, and that he was actually the writer of them. But, did the acquaintances of Boyd know him? Had they ſtudied his character? Did they diſcover, that he was a very able, and a very artful man, even at the age of twenty-one? Did they ſtudy what he *did* write; in order to enable them to judge what he *could* write?

(e) Anecdotes, vol. i. p. 11—17.

(f) Preface, xvii.

From

From theſe queſtions, we are naturally led into an inveſtigation of the human character. It was only from the writings of Pope, who did not figure in converſation, that Lord Oxford knew, what finiſhed productions his frequent gueſt could dictate. From the converſation of Pſalmanazer, the univerſity of Oxford never diſcovered his impoſture. From the converſation of Lauder, did Johnſon conſider, that he was throwing away his patronage on an impoſtor? Did Horace Walpole diſcover, from the correſpondence of Chatterton, what ſuch a boy could forge, or write? Did Edmund Burke imagine, when he received M'Aulay-Boyd into his family, that he had admitted to his intimacy a writer, who would palm upon him his own productions? Did the friends of Mathias learn from his converſation, that he had the malignity to conceive, or the pen to ſcribble, the *Purſuits of Literature?* No: By his friends I have been told a thouſand times, that his ſpirit was too mild, and his talents were too feeble, for the execution of a lampoon, ſo malevolent, and extenſive: Yet, is it a *moral certainty*, that Mathias wrote, and publiſhed, the *Purſuits of Literature.* The anſwers to thoſe queſtions, then, appear to inculcate, that it is not acquaintance, nor intimacy, with him, that can diſcover the true character of any man, who is by nature ſubtile, and by practice ſly.

It is not, therefore, for thoſe, who knew M'Aulay-Boyd upon the town, before his character was aſcertained, or his talents were tried, to ſay, negatively, againſt ſo many affirmative proofs, that HE was neither the writer of Junius's Letters, nor capable of writing them.

This

This concluſion has been already, in a great meaſure, anticipated: For, I have before ſhown, that Chatterton, a younger perſon than M'Aulay; a greater genius; a political writer of equal powers was buſily employed, during the ſame period, in impoſing on credulity, and in miſleading weakneſs. I have proved, by examples, that *Junius* was neither ſo high, nor *M'Aulay* ſo low, as too many ſuppoſe. I have compared the principles, and peculiarities, of both; their topicks of argument, and figures of ſtyle. I will now offer a comparative ſpecimen of each, taken from the firſt letter of *Junius (g)*, and from the firſt paper of *the Whig (h)*:

JUNIUS. 21ſt Jan. 1769.

" The ſubmiſſion of a free
" people to the executive autho-
" rity of government is no more
" than a compliance with laws,
" which they themſelves have
" enacted. While the national
" honour is firmly maintained
" abroad, and while juſtice is
" impartially adminiſtered at
" home, the obedience of the
" ſubject will be voluntary,
" chearful, and I might almoſt
" ſay unlimited. A generous
" nation is grateful even for
" the preſervation of its rights,
" and willingly extends the re-
" ſpect due to the office of a
" good

The WHIG. Nov. 1779.

" I truſt that neither my name
" nor principles are obſolete;
" though I am aware that the
" name is not in ſuch reſpect,
" nor the principles *yet* ſo active,
" as at the period of the Revo-
" lution. But, if I did not feel
" myſelf warranted, in the hope
" that I addreſs a powerful body
" of my countrymen, when I
" call on my brethren of *The*
" *good old Cauſe*, I would not
" waſte my labour on a deſpe-
" rate theme, nor profane the
" doctrine of liberty, by diſ-
" cuſſing it to unanimous ſlaves.
" Whiggiſm we have ſeen
" triumphant

(g). Gen. Ed. vol. 1. p. 1.
(h). Alm. Anec. vol. 3. p. 1.

"good prince into an affection
"for his perſon. Loyalty, in
"the heart and underſtanding
"of an Engliſhman, is a rational
"attachment to the guardian of
"the laws. Prejudices and
"paſſions have ſometimes car-
"ried it to a criminal length;
"and, whatever foreigners may
"imagine, we know that Eng-
"liſhmen have erred as much
"in a miſtaken zeal for parti-
"cular perſons and families, as
"they ever did in defence of
"what they thought moſt dear
"and intereſting to themſelves.

"It naturally fills us with re-
"ſentment, to ſee ſuch a temper
"inſulted and abuſed. In read-
"ing the hiſtory of a free peo-
"ple, whoſe rights have been
"invaded, we are intereſted in
"their cauſe. Our own feel-
"ings tell us how long they
"ought to have ſubmitted, and
"at what moment it would have
"been treachery to themſelves
"not to have reſiſted. How
"much warmer will be our re-
"ſentment, if experience ſhould
"bring the fatal example home
"to ourſelves.

"The ſituation of this coun-
"try is alarming enough to
"rouſe the attention of every
"man, who pretends to a con-
"cern for the public welfare.
"Appearances juſtify ſuſpicion;
"and
"triumphant in America. Whig-
"giſm we ſee preparing her
"triumph in Ireland. Let us
"hope, let us prove, that her
"ſacred flame is not extinct in
"England.

"If a ſlave of power ſhrink
"from the mention of the good
"old cauſe, or, in the callous
"impudence of ſervitude, pre-
"ſume to villify it, I pity his
"wretchedneſs, I deſpiſe his in-
"ſolence; but I would puniſh
"his treaſon to the conſtitution.

"The good old cauſe is the
"cauſe of the people. Simple
"and obvious is this conſidera-
"tion; that *the cauſe of the peo-*
"*ple is ſucceſsful exactly in pro-*
"*portion to the energy of their ori-*
"*ginal power.* Such energy,
"acting through the claſſes of
"the conſtitution, which the
"people made, preſerves their
"liberty as a people, and their
"power as a nation; for it
"watches integrity, and pro-
"vides ability, in the perſons
"they permit to adminiſter
"their affairs. Various and in-
"tricate, on the contrary, are
"the means conducive to *their*
"cauſe; ambition, avarice, or
"ſloth, would enſlave, impo-
"veriſh, or loſe their country.
"Rectitude has only one direc-
"tion, but the obliquity of
"treachery is infinite.

"The

" and when the ſafety of a na-
" tion is at ſtake, ſuſpicion is a
" juſt ground of enquiry. Let
" us enter into it with candour
" and decency. Reſpect is due
" to the ſtation of miniſters;
" and, if a reſolution muſt at
" laſt be taken, there is none ſo
" likely to be ſupported with
" firmneſs, as that which has
" been adopted with modera-
" tion. Without much politi-
" cal ſagacity, or any extraordi-
" nary depth of obſervation, we
" need only mark how the prin-
" cipal departments of the ſtate
" are beſtowed, and look no far-
" ther for the true cauſe of
" every miſchief that befals
" us."

" The direction in which the
" people of this country act,
" when they act rightly, is,
" through the parliament which
" they have elected, to the
" throne which they have raiſed.
" If wickedneſs or weakneſs be
" found in the counſels or coun-
" ſellors of the crown, parlia-
" ment is the inſtrument ap-
" pointed to puniſh or to diſ-
" miſs; but if the inſtrument
" fail, the land will exert her
" native ſtrength. The people,
" of original right as a free
" people, will vindicate the
" country, correct their parlia-
" ment, and reform their
" throne."

Such is the ſimilarity of the two papers, by the ſame writer, at the diſtance of ten years, that the acuteſt critic cannot tell *Junius* from the *Whig*; if you allow him, only, the uſe of his underſtanding, by ſhutting his eyes to the ſignatures. It is not, therefore, conſiſtent with the good ſenſe of thoſe, who have hazarded their opinions, that the writer of the one was unequal to the writing of the other. I will ſubmit to the judicious reader, another ſpecimen of the ſame writer, under different ſignatures; in order that the topicks, as well as the ſtyle, may more manifeſtly appear:

The

The ſentiments of JUNIUS, on the maxim, that *the King can do no wrong*:

[Gen. Ed. Preface, p. xxvii.]

"Some opinion may now be "expected from me, upon a "point of equal delicacy to the "writer, and hazard to the "printer. When the character "of the chief magiſtrate is in "queſtion, more muſt be under-"ſtood, than may be ſafely ex-"preſſed. If it be really a part "of our conſtitution, and not a "mere *dictum* of the law, *that* "*the King can do no wrong*, it is "not the only inſtance, in the "wiſeſt of human inſtitutions, "where theory is at variance "with practice.—That the ſo-"vereign of this country is not "amenable to any form of trial, "known to the laws, is unqueſ-"tionable. But exemption from "puniſhment is a ſingular pri-"vilege annexed to the royal "character, and no way ex-"cludes the poſſibility of de-"ſerving it. How long, and "to what extent a king of "*England* may be protected by "the forms, when he violates "the ſpirit of the conſtitution, "deſerves to be conſidered. A "miſtake in this matter proved "fatal to *Charles* and his ſon. "For my own part, far from "thinking that the king can do "no wrong, far from ſuffering "myſelf

The ſentiments of the WHIG, on the maxim, that *the King can do no wrong*:

[Alm. Anec. v. 3. App. p. 6-7.]

"When a monarch in this "country, ſprung from what-"ever line, adorned with what-"ever hopes from the glories of "his anceſtry, or his own ori-"ginal virtues, perſiſts in coun-"ſels that do grievous wrong, "and threaten inſtant ruin; "affection is loſt in duty. Du-"ty to the country demands diſ-"cuſſion of a maxim, which, "if the conſtruction of the "court were permitted, would "ſanctify every public crime, "and eſtabliſh public calamity. "Duty to the prince, as part of "the conſtitution formed by "the people, enjoins conſtitu-"tional explanation to him of a "phraſe, which flattery has "rendered fatal to tyrants.

"When it is truly ſaid, that "the king can do no wrong, "the office is intended and not "the perſon; and this true con-"ſtruction is the perfect praiſe "of our admirable conſtitution. "The king of England can do "no wrong; for it is not the office "of the king *to do* any thing. "The cautious wiſdom of our "policy will not permit the "king to act. It not only ſup-"poſes, but requires, that abi-"lity ſhall be ſelected from the "people

" myſelf to be deterred or im-
" poſed upon by the language
" of forms, in oppoſition to the
" ſubſtantial evidence of truth, if
" it were my misfortune to live
" under the inauſpicious reign
" of ſuch a prince, I would not
" ſcruple to declare to him—
" 'You have no enemies, ſir, but
" thoſe, who perſuade you to
" aim at power without right,
" and who think it flattery to
" tell you that the character of
" king diſſolves the natural re-
" lation between guilt and pu-
" niſhment.'——The houſe of
" commons are only interpre-
" ters, whoſe duty it is to con-
" vey the ſenſe of the people
" faithfully to the crown. If the
" interpretation be falſe or im-
" perfect, the conſtituent powers
" are called upon to deliver
" their own ſentiments. Their
" ſpeech is rude, but intelli-
" gible;—their geſtures force,
" but full of explanation. Per-
" plexed by ſophiſtries, their
" honeſt eloquence riſes into
" action. Their firſt appeal was
" to the integrity of their repre-
" ſentatives;—the ſecond to the
" King's juſtice;—the laſt argu-
" ment of the people, whenever
" they have recourſe to it, will
" carry more perhaps than per-
" ſuaſion to parliament, or ſup-
" plication to the throne."—
[Gen. Ad. v. 2. p. 89.]

" people to execute the active
" duties of the ſtate. Even in
" the ſelection of ſuch active
" ability for public ſervice, the
" king, as we are now conſider-
" ing him, cannot do wrong.
" For the conſideration ſuppoſes
" him in his conſtitutional pub-
" lic character; a character con-
" ferred on him, conditionally,
" by the people. The condi-
" tion of his royalty is a wiſe
" and honeſt adminiſtration of
" the ſtate. It is impoſſible,
" therefore, in conſtitutional
" contemplation, that a *King of*
" *England* ſhould appoint inca-
" pable or unworthy men to ad-
" miniſter public affairs; or, if
" appointed, that *the people of*
" *England* ſhould permit them
" to be retained; that a free
" people ſhould ſacrifice their
" original rights and conſtitu-
" tive power to ſuch abuſe of
" the kingly office. The un-
" fairneſs of arguing from ſuch
" abuſe is evident. The kingly
" office ſo abuſed would no
" longer belong to the conſti-
" tution. It is a monſtrous
" caſe, and out of the ſuppo-
" ſition of fair reaſoning.—*Ob-*
" *ſtinate* adherence, therefore,
" to ſuch a principle, induces
" the inevitable alternative of
" ſlavery in the people, or the
" perſonal reſponſibility of ma-
" jeſty. The latter has a pre-
" cedent, in our hiſtory; the
" former has no example."

It

It thus appears, that rancorous enmity to the perſon of the King was one of the moſt diſtinguiſhing characteriſtics of M'Aulay Boyd, under whatever ſignature he wrote. It was this odious propenſity, which induced Mr. Horne to ſay: "Whatever may be the "ſtate of politics in this country, the principles of "Junius will ſuit no form of government *(i)*. They "are not to be tolerated under any conſtitution. "Perſonal enmity is a motive fit only for the devil. "Whoever, or whatever, is ſovereign, demands the "reſpect and ſupport of the people *(k)*." What was

(i) Junius himſelf complains, "that he was diſowned, as a "dangerous auxiliary, by every party in the kingdom." [Let. xliv. Gen. Ed. vol. 2. p. 151.]—No wonder! His principles, and practices, were only fit for a party of *United-Iriſhmen*. See his Letter of the 24th of July 1771, which is too groſs to be repeated.

(k) Ib. 2 vol. p. 226:—The letters of Junius are, hiſtorically, noticed by Mr. William Belſham, as written in a maſterly ſtyle; yet, as being little elſe than ſplendid declamation, and poignant invective, which diſcovered a deliberate malignity of diſpoſition; and which now excite diſguſt rather than admiration. Adverting to Junius's charges againſt the Duke of Bedford, the Duke of Grafton, and Sir William Draper, the hiſtorian juſtly remarks, that as the author of ſuch malignant accuſations baſely ſhrinks from ſubſequent inveſtigation, though repeatedly called on, he "ſtands "recorded to all future times, as a LIAR, an ASSASSIN, and a "COWARD:" Yet, Mr. William Belſham appears not to have been ſo much affected by Junius's traitorous attempts upon the King's perſon, as by his anonymous accuſations of the old Duke of Bedford, the preſent Duke of Grafton, and the late Sir William Draper: For, Mr. William Belſham proceeds, narratively, to lay before his readers, "the moſt ſtriking and *faithful* picture" of his adminiſtration, which was ſubmitted to the King, by this LIAR, and ASSASSIN. [See the Hiſtory of Great Britain from the Revolution till the Concluſion of the Seſſion of 1793, 4to. vol. 2.

was thus, fitly, ſaid by Mr. Horne, almoſt thirty years ago, I apply, at preſent, to *the Whig*, to *the Antrim Freeholder*, and to M'Aulay Boyd, without any rancour to his perſon, which I never knew; but, with abhorrence of his principles, which are, in themſelves, deteſtable. I ſaid, in my *Supplemental Apology*, that M'Aulay was an *United Iriſhman*, without meaning to ſay, that he was of a ſociety, which, in his time, did not formally exiſt. But, his jacobinical maxims, and his anarchical practices, appeared to me to be ſuch, as to conſtitute him, one of the legitimate progenitors of that ſubtile ſect.

I have now ſhown, by examples, that thoſe, who have ſaid, that M'Aulay Boyd could not write *Junius*, had little ſtudied his genuine writings. But, of *negative arguments*, however abſurd, when placed in oppoſition to *affirmative proofs*, there is no end. The publication of my *Supplemental Apology* ſeems to have given riſe to a conteſt, and to inquiries, in the news-papers, and literary journals, which conſiſt almoſt wholly of *negative* proofs. The parties did not pretend to know any thing, affirmatively, of *the Author* of *Junius*: They, only, inſiſt, that every other perſon was full as ignorant as themſelves: They claim the honour, however, of "expoſing an attempt to "miſlead the world by a *pretended diſcovery* of that "*incom-*

p. 166—7.] Mr. W. Belſham might have found ſatisfactory evidence to prove, that Junius republiſhed, in his Genuine Edition, ſeveral charges againſt the Duke of Bedford, which he muſt have known to be untrue. Several perſons, who had taſted the Duke's bounty, avowed, in the News-papers, their gratitude for his generoſity. Theſe fugitive documents have been preſerved in the Scots Mag. 1769, p. 573—5.

"*incomparable author(l)*." Yet, this *pretended diſcovery* has, actually, exiſted upwards of thirty years. Truth tried to triumph over falſehood, ſeventeen years after the firſt diſcovery: But, *intereſt* ſtept out to the aid of *fiction*. The truth made another attempt to gain upon the world a dozen years afterwards: But, as neither intereſt, nor malevolence, oppoſed her progreſs, ſhe advanced with more confident ſteps. Whether the preſent endeavours of truth, to gain a final triumph over the impertinence of negative aſſumptions, the malignity of affected fairneſs, and the dogmatiſm of critical prejudice, muſt be left to *experience*, which declares: *Magna eſt veritas et prævalebit*.

Among the negative witneſſes, who merit attention, are Mr. H. S. Woodfall, the original printer, and Mr. William Woodfall, the firſt inſpector of Junius's letters; who both have ſaid, that Boyd was not the writer of Junius's epiſtles. As to the firſt; we

(l) In the *True Briton* of the 31ſt Auguſt 1799, appeared the following paragraph, from the well known pen of one of the moſt active of the PHILO JUNIUS's: "Some malevolent witlings are "attempting to be facetious on the writers, who have lately em-"ployed their pens on the ſubject of JUNIUS. But, it ſhould be "obſerved, that thoſe writers did not come forward under the "idea of *diſcovering Junius*, but of expoſing an attempt to miſ-"lead the world, by a *pretended diſcovery* of that incomparable "author. To ſome men, however, the prevalence of truth, or "falſehood, is a matter of indifference; or, rather, perhaps, they "feel a malignant pleaſure when *falſehood* is triumphant." Yes; ſwindlers are apt to talk about *impoſitions on the world*; as thieves are very ready to cry out "Stop thief!" And one of the moſt malevolent writers, in the preſent day, comes forth, with a very happy grace, to complain of the malignant pleaſure, which ſome perſons take in giving a triumph to falſehood.

have it in evidence, that when applied to, both directly, and indirectly, in 1769, he ſaid, "that thoſe "letters came to him in ſuch a manner, that he did "not inquire after, or *know the writer*, at that time." It does not appear, that the original printer was much better informed, at the end of eight-and-twenty years: For, a few weeks after the publication of Almon's *Anecdotes*, in 1797, Mr. H. S. Woodfall, meeting the Anecdote writer, at Longman's ſhop, complimented him, on his entertaining book; "but ſaid that he was "miſtaken, in ſuppoſing Mr. Boyd to have been the "author of Junius's Letters; and then added, with "an *emphaſis*, "'that Mr. Boyd was not the author "'of them.'" To theſe emphatical obſervations, Mr. Almon replied, "that he had no doubt of Mr. Boyd's "being the author of thoſe letters; that as you, Mr. "H. S. Woodfall, never knew who was the author, "you cannot undertake to ſay, who was *not* the "author of thoſe letters *(1)*." Mr. Woodfall departed, without making any reply. What reply could

(1) This converſation of the printer, and the bookſeller, is given from Mr. Almon's unpubliſhed letter before mentioned; and it happened before Mr. Longman, his partner, Mr. Rees, and ſome of their clerks, ſays Almon, in his printed letter of the 13th of Auguſt 1799. Mr. W. Woodfall, plainly, miſconceived what Mr. Almon ſaid of his brother's converſation, in Longman's ſhop: For, he did not ſay, that H. S. Woodfall acknowledged, "he never knew who the writer of Junius was." Mr. Almon only argued, *hypothetically*, "as you never knew the author, you "ought *not* to ſay who *was not* the author." I will ſuppoſe an iſſue joined in Weſtminſter-hall, on a wager laid, whether Boyd wrote Junius's Letters; and that Almon, and the two Woodfalls are the witneſſes: Almon, for the affirmative; and the other two for

could he make? It is abſurd in any man, who does not know the true author of Junius's letters, to ſay, that M'Aulay Boyd was *not* the writer of them, in oppoſition to affirmative proofs. Yet, Mr. H. S. Woodfall afterwards told Mr. L. D. Campbell, that "Mr. Boyd was *not* the writer of Junius's Letters," without pretending, however, that he knew the true author. It ought, moreover, to be remembered, that

for the negative. Almon teſtifies, that Boyd was the writer of Junius's Letters: Why do you think, and ſay, ſo? Becauſe, in 1769, ſuſpecting Boyd, I taxed him with being the writer, when he *coloured*; and turned off the converſation by an obvious remark—Have you any other reaſon? Yes; when I was proſecuted for republiſhing Junius, I obſerved, that Boyd, who was in the habit of coming to me two, or three times a week, did not come near me, during the pendency of the proſecution; but, afterwards, called upon me as uſual—Have you any other reaſon? Yes; I do know, that Boyd wrote the WHIG; and I have thought myſelf, and been told by gentlemen, who had fifty times more underſtanding, and learning, than I pretend to, that *the Whig* contains paſſages of as much force, and elegance, as any in Junius.——A diſpaſſionate judge would conſider theſe aſſeverations, as very ſtrong affirmative reaſons, when coupled with the notorious fact, that Boyd was then a public writer.——On the *negative* queſtion, the two Woodfalls ſay, That, in their opinions, Boyd did not write Junius. Why do you affirm ſo? We do not think he was capable of writing Junius. Do you know that Boyd wrote *the Whig?* No: Do you know, that he wrote the *Anirim Freeholder?* No: Do you know what he could write? No: Do you know, who did write Junius? No: Do you know, that Boyd was ſtrongly ſuſpected, thirty years ago, as the writer of Junius? No: Do you know, that Boyd was deſcribed as the writer of Junius, in a news-paper, upwards of a dozen years ago? No.—Now; is there any judge, who would not ſay, that the weight of evidence was for the affirmative? Is there any jury, who would not find for the affirmative ſide of the iſſue joined, whether Boyd wrote Junius?

that when *Junius* ſent the *corrected edition* of his letters to Mr. H. S. Woodfall, he told the people of England, "*I am the ſole depoſitary of my own ſecret*, and *it* "*ſhall periſh with me.*" There is reaſon to believe, that he perſevered, in his purpoſe, to the end. Yet, ſays Mr. W. Woodfall, *Junius* promiſed my brother, "that he would one day let him into the ſecret." This promiſe, indeed, may have been made by JUNIUS, before his engagement to the public, that *his ſecret ſhould periſh with him.* It is now ſelf-evident, that H. S. Woodfall never was ſo far let into the ſecret, as to know the true author of Junius's letters.

Mr. William Woodfall came forward, like an *amicus curiæ*, to give his voluntary teſtimony, on this litigated queſtion: And he ſays, in ſubſtance, that the writer of *Junius* publiſhed, in *The Public Advertiſer*, under the ſeveral ſignatures of *Lucius*, of *Junius*, and of *Brutus*, excluſive of the auxiliary ſignature of *Philo-Junius*; that his brother ſhewed him, before the publication, every one of thoſe letters [under all thoſe ſignatures] in manuſcript, "which bore no appearance "of being written in a diſguiſed hand *(n)*;" that during the ſplendid period of Junius's publication

[1769

(n) We have it in evidence, "that previous to the appear-"ance of Junius, Boyd was at wonderful pains, in accuſtoming "himſelf to diſguiſe his hand-writing."—It would require ſtrong proof, indeed, to ſatisfy a reaſonable mind, that the writer of Junius's Letters would ſend them to the printer in his real hand-writing. It is impoſſible to conceive, that ſuch a man, as Boyd, would take ſuch ſucceſsful pains to diſguiſe his hand-writing, if he had not had ſome deſign to deceive the world. He employed alſo his wife to write for him ſome of his letters; viz. that to Sir Fletcher Norton, &c.

[1769-1770-1771] Mr. Hugh Boyd was likewiſe in the habit of correſponding with *The Public Advertiſer*, *without* being *ſtudious to conceal himſelf (o)*; that, however, he might diſguiſe his hand-writing, which cannot eaſily be ſo diſguiſed, as to deceive the *acute diſcernment of a news-paper printer*, Boyd could not, as all muſt admit, diſguiſe his ſtyle, and "leaſt of all, "in that moſt extraordinary way of *writing infinitely* "*above his own reach of literary talents*:" that in the ſame period, "the writer of Junius ſent ſeveral pri-"vate letters to his brother, ſome of them contain-"ing letters to individuals of diſtinguiſhed characters, "which he requeſted his brother to convey *(p)*."

The curious world is much obliged to Mr. W. Woodfall, for this voluntary evidence. It is an important fact, that Boyd lived in London, during the years 1769, 1770, and 1771; and, in theſe years, was in the frequent practice of correſponding with the printer of the *Public Advertiſer*; becauſe this fact precludes the notion of an *alibi*: It is a fact, of leſs importance, that the writer of Junius, ſent to the printer,

(o) This fact ſhows Boyd to have been a very artful man: For, by not ſtudying to be concealed, as *Boyd*, he effectually concealed himſelf, as *Junius*, and deluded the printers, with all their pretenſions to deep ſagacity.

(p) It is in evidence, however, that Boyd ſometimes employed his wife to carry to the printer's box many letters, which were written, in his diſguiſed hand; the contents of which ſhe did not know. A man, who could employ his wife, on ſuch errands, could eaſily find a woman in Fleet-ſtreet, who would ſtep to the neighbouring printer, with any kind of letters. Here, then, is an additional proof, that Boyd was a very artful perſon, who knew perfectly the true ſecret of conveying his political letters with perfect ſafety.

printer, letters for diſtinguiſhed characters, to be conveyed by him; becauſe, this evidence proves, that Junius was not written by any perſon of eminence, either in rank, or in literature; as ſuch letters, he muſt know, could have been ſent, by the penny poſt, with greater ſecrecy, and more ſafety: But, the fact does not either prove, or diſprove, that Boyd was *not* the writer of Junius's letters; neither does the evidence, about the ſimilarity of hand-writing, prove any thing, in this queſtion; as it is impoſſible for the acuteſt printer to tell, what diſguiſes an artful man can aſſume. But, this voluntary witneſs does not bring any ſatisfactory evidence, either to prove his own *negative*, or to impugn the *affirmative* of others. He ſhows, plainly, that he does not know the writer of Junius; and of courſe evinces, that he ought to be leſs poſitive in his aſſertions, and leſs free in his charges. To the logick, which aſſumes the very point, which he ought to prove, I ſay nothing, in reprobation. But, his want of proof, and deficiency of argument, he ſupplies, *Junius-like*, by ſome *imagery*. Our *Amicus Curiæ* obſerves "that Boyd's compoſition, though tole-"rably adapted to winter wear, like a frieze home "ſpun great coat, is not to be compared to the ſuper-"fine broad cloth of JUNIUS, manufactured from the "beſt Spaniſh wool, and equally ornamental, and ſer-"viceable, in all ſeaſons." If it were proper to diſpute about *taſte*, I would ſay, that I regard *Junius*, as only an *Iriſh* POPLIN, which may glitter on a birth day; but, is quite unfit, for daily uſe, in any ſeaſon.

But, let us examine a ſample, or two, of Boyd's *frieze home-ſpun*, as we ſee it, in *The Indian Obſerver*, which

is the only remarkable ſtuff of our manufacturer, that Mr. W. Woodfall appears to have ever handled, except Junius. Speaking of IMPERIAL ROME, BOYD obſerves *(q)*: "While we contemplate the immortal "monuments of learning, and genius, of philoſophy, "oratory, and poetry, which *ſhe* has bequeathed to "the admiration of poſterity; we are condemned, at "the ſame time, to view, with a ſigh for the imper- "fection of our nature, the follies, that diſgraced her "wiſdom, and the vices, that ſullied her glories. More "fatal, than the moſt hoſtile arms, according to the "ſatiriſt, luxury undermined the greatneſs, invin- "cible to every other foe; and the victors of man- "kind, vanquiſhed by themſelves, gave to the world "the revenge it could not take." Pray, is there any better cloth to be found, in the ſhop of JUNIUS, than we have thus from the homely hand of our manufacturer of frieze? Phoh, Sir, *homeſpun!*

Why; then, let us try another ſample. Speaking of the two moſt powerful, and perſevering, paſſions of the human heart, Boyd obſerves *(r)*: "Ambi- "tion, and avarice, would ſeem to be as remote, in "their nature, and as contradiſtinguiſhed in their "principle, and object, as any two diſpoſitions of the "mind. Yet, however more brilliant the colours, "and *coſtume*, of the one, than of the other, they will "be found wonderfully to approximate in their deſign, "and compoſition. In ſupport of this apparent pa- "radox, the fact might be obſerved, of their often "finding their place in the ſame breaſt. Two noto- "ble inſtances occur, in modern, and ancient, hiſ-

(q) Obſerver, No. 2. Campbell's edit. p. 48.
(r) Obſerver, No. 4. Camp. edit. p. 58.

"tory,

" tory, of equal avarice of military glory, and private " profit. The princely poſſeſſor of Blenheim, while " he directed the ſtorm, and decided the fortune of " war, was no leſs attentive to his own. He "' ſaved "' a nation, and he ſaved a groat."' Nor, were the " occaſional attentions of his Grace's prototype, the " victorious Craſſus, leſs famous or certain. While " his Roman eagles purſued the defeat, not a Roman " in the ranks was more attentive to the plunder of " the flying Parthian.

" But without inſiſting on examples, let theſe lead- " ing qualities be fairly conſidered in the abſtract; " and let the conſideration be diveſted of the glare " which ſurrounds the one, and the prejudicial miſt " that obſcures the other, diſtinction and pre-emi- " nence are the objects of both; and ardent attention " and unwearied perſeverance, are their mutual prin- " ciples. It is true, that the pre-eminence ambitioned " by the one, and the diſtinction coveted by the other, " are ſomewhat different in their ſpecific *nature (s)*. " But this is rather a nominal, than a real objection to " the poſition, and is founded more on accident, than " on any intrinſic or eſſential difference.—If ſuch be " the proximity of the paſſions, let due conſideration " be uſed to diſtinguiſh them, and candour to appre- " ciate; and, if ſuch be their power, let proportionate " care be exerted to regulate and direct them. Let " it be remembered, according to the expreſſive meta- " phor of our moral poet, that they are only "' the

(s) See the ungrammatical pen of Junius! Boyd is ſpeaking of *two* natures; and he applies to them *nature*, in the ſingular; as may be frequently ſeen, in the preceding page.

" "' gales

" "" gales of life,"" and let reaſon ſtand to the helm!"—
Is not this broad cloth? Phoh, Sir, only *frieze!*

As faſtidiouſneſs is ever hard to pleaſe, let us examine another ſample! Speaking on the ſubject of female occupations, Boyd obſerves: *(t)* " If I might
" be indulged with leave to ſuggeſt the ſubject of
" reading, which appears to unite the uſeful and the
" pleaſing, more than any other, I ſhould point to the
" muſe whom Mr. Addiſon ſelected for his ſignature
" to the Spectator; the muſe of hiſtory. Clio unites
" all the intereſt of her ſiſter muſes of the drama, with
" the maxims of truth, and doctrines of philoſophy;
" whoſe precepts, in her ſacred page, are recommended
" and fortified by the moſt brilliant examples, from
" the real drama of the world. Plutarch, it may be
" preſumed, will be found rather more inſtructive,
" and not leſs entertaining, than the lives and loves of
" a circulating library. The death of Arria with her
" huſband, is ſurely as intereſting, and at leaſt as moral,
" as the motley exit of Eloiſa, lamenting her lover,
" and careleſs of her lord. Or, to come to examples
" nearer the preſent manners, is not the fourth Henry
" of France as reſpectable a rake as any noble Rué de
" Paris, and was not our own Sir Philip Sydney as
" accompliſhed a knight as even Sir Charles Grandiſon?
" Rollin, who was no leſs a critic of taſte than an
" hiſtorian of eminence, has proved how much the
" latter capacity contributed to the former. His
" *Belle Aſſemblée* owed much to his *Hiſtoire Ancienne*;
" and, certainly, the ſubject received reflected ad-

(t) Obſerver, N° X. Camph. ed. p. 105.

" vantage

" vantage from the charms of the diſcuſſion. Never, " indeed, can knowledge appear ſo lovely, as when " adorned with female elegance; nor ever are the " attractions of the ſex ſo irreſiſtible, as when beauty " is refined by underſtanding."—Phoh, Sir, Phoh!!

" What *heroes homeſpuns* have we ſwaggering here,
" So near the cradle of the fairy queen!!!

Well: The declamations of *Junius* are, doubtleſs, different from the diſcourſes of *The Obſerver*. *Junius* is *diſputative*; the *Obſerver* is *didactic*: Junius abounds in all the dexterities of ſophiſtry, in the poignancy of invective, and the energies of ſedition: The buſineſs of *the Obſerver* is not to diſpute, but to inſtruct; not to irritate, but to pleaſe; not to offend by oppoſition, but to attract general approbation, by exhibiting ſplendid views of familiar objects: The compariſon, therefore, of theſe two writers, is not quite fair; ſince they were written upon ſuch different principles, with ſuch oppoſite aims. Let us, then, compare a ſample of the ſame writer, under different ſignatures, when both his end, and his means, were the ſame; as they appear in *Junius (u)*, and the *Whig (x)*:

JUNIUS *to Lord* Mansfield, *the Chief Juſtice*, January 1772.

" I have undertaken to prove " that when, at the interceſſion " of three of your countrymen, " you bailed *John Eyre*, you did " that, *which by law you were* " *not*

The WHIG *to Lord* Thurlow, *the Chancellor, in* Jan. 1780.

" I have acknowledged your " rank, my Lord, and your " high titles, with the pleaſure " that every liberal mind feels " in doing juſtice to an eminent " character.

(u) Gen. edit. Vol. II. p 309.
(x) Almon's Anecdotes, Vol. III. Appendix, p. 17.

" *not warranted to do*, and that " a felon, under the circum- " ſtances, *of being taken in the* " *fact, with the ſtolen goods upon* " *him, and making no defence, is* " *not bailable* by the laws of " England. Your learned ad- " vocates have interpreted this " charge into a denial that the " Court of King's-Bench, or the " Judges of that Court during " the vacation, have any greater " authority to bail for criminal " offences, than a juſtice of peace. " With the inſtance before me, " I am ſuppoſed to queſtion your " power of doing wrong, and " to deny the exiſtence of a " power, at the ſame moment " that I arraign the illegal ex- " erciſe of it. But the opinions " of ſuch men, whether wilful " in their malignity, or ſincere " in their ignorance, are un- " worthy of my notice. You, " Lord Mansfield, did not un- " derſtand me ſo, and, I promiſe " you, your cauſe requires an " abler defence.—I am now to " make good my charge againſt " you. However dull my argu- " ment, the ſubject of it is in- " tereſting. I ſhall be honoured " with the attention of the pub- " lic, and have a right to de- " mand the attention of the le- " giſlature. Supported, as I am, " by the whole body of the cri- " minal " character. Every man is ready " to confeſs, that they have been " earned by abilities as ſuperior, " as the independence and honour " ought to be, which alone can " dignify their nature or juſtify " their tenure. But, there, my " Lord, on that cardinal point, " the public judgement has been " long ſuſpended. If I add, that " the ſcale is now rapidly de- " ſcending againſt you, and that " the wonder of your talents " avails only to give weight and " acceleration to the cenſure of " your conduct, your Lordſhip " will confeſs the juſtice of your " country, when you recollect " yourſelf, and look round on " the men whoſe cauſe you con- " deſcend to plead.

" One of that public who de- " lighted in admiring, and who " now exerciſe with pain their " right of judging you, I yet " offer myſelf to your Lordſhip " as your friend. And though " the friendſhip of honeſt re- " proof be in general equally " thankleſs and fruitleſs, I rely " on the manlineſs of your mind " for its public effect in this " inſtance, and even for your " Lordſhip's gratitude.

" Before our correſpondence " proceeds, let me clear its way " to your underſtanding and your " approbation.

" This

" minal law of England, I have
" no doubt of eſtabliſhing my
" charge. If, on your part, you
" ſhould have no plain, ſubſtan-
" tial defence, but ſhould endea-
" vour to ſhelter yourſelf under
" the quirk and evaſion of a
" practiſing lawyer, or under the
" mere, inſulting aſſertion of
" power without right, the repu-
" tation you pretend to, is gone
" for ever;—you ſtand degraded
" from the reſpect and authority
" of your office, and are no
" longer, *de jure*, Lord Chief
" Juſtice of England. This let-
" ter, my Lord, is addreſſed, not
" ſo much to *you*, as to the pub-
" lic. Learned as you are, and
" quick in apprehenſion, few
" arguments are neceſſary to
" ſatisfy you, that you have
" done that, which by law you
" were not warranted to do.
" Your conſcience already tells
" you, that you have ſinned
" againſt knowledge, and that
" whatever defence you make,
" contradicts your own internal
" conviction. But other men are
" willing enough to take the law
" upon truſt. They rely upon
" your authority, becauſe they
" are too indolent to ſearch for
" information; or, conceiving
" that there is ſome myſtery in
" the laws of their country,
" which lawyers only are qua-

" lified

" This letter is written, and
" unleſs rendered unneceſſary,
" more ſhall be addreſſed to your
" Lordſhip, not as a public man
" who influences public affairs,
" but as the Dictator of the State
" who decides them; I do not
" ſay immediately in council,
" but certainly in effect. Your
" Lordſhip already underſtands
" me, and ſo will the people be-
" fore our correſpondence cloſes.
" In the mean time I ſtate my-
" ſelf to your Lordſhip and my
" country, not alone juſtified but
" impelled to repreſent you to
" yourſelf, and explain you to
" the public, in all your preſent
" power and all its fatal con-
" ſequence; impelled, by what
" your own nervous eloquence
" too conſciouſly deſcribes " the
" " abundant danger and exi-
" " gence of the time."

" I do not argue unfairly
" with your Lordſhip, when I
" aſſume the fact of our miſ-
" government for the laſt ten
" years. *I know* the contempt
" with which the ſuperiority of
" your mind has looked down
" to the wretchedneſs of the
" adminiſtration.

" I admire the emphatic zeal
" for your own dignity, with
" which you have ever diſ-
" claimed all fellowſhip, even
" perſonal acquaintance, with

" the

" lified to explain, they diſtruſt " their judgement, and volun- " tarily renouuce the right of " thinking for themſelves. With " all the evidence of hiſtory " before them, from *Treſillian* to " *Jefferies*, from *Jefferies* to *Mans-* " *field*, they will not believe it " poſſible that a learned judge " can act in direct contradiction " to thoſe laws, which he is ſup- " poſed to have made the ſtudy " of his life, and which he has " ſworn to adminiſter faithfully. " Superſtition is certainly not " the characteriſtic of this age, " Yet ſome men are bigoted " in politics, who are infidels in " religion.—I do not deſpair of " making them aſhamed of their " credulity."

" the Prime Miniſter. And it " was in theſe ſentiments that I " hoped, and the public expected, " my Lord, you would have diſ- " dained all continuance of pub- " lic connection with him. A " man of ſpirit, it was concluded " that you would not devote " yourſelf for ever to puſillani- " mity and diſhonour; a man of " activity and vigour, it was " deemed impoſſible that you " ſhould be rivetted to indolence " and lethargy, and that the " only exertion of your great " talents ſhould be in defence of " ignorance, and inſenſibility, " which they had attempted in " vain to inform, and animate. " Such, my Lord, was the per- " ſuaſion of a people who were " willing to confide at leaſt in " your magnanimity: And even " yet it is hoped, that you will " not thwart your nature, be- " cauſe it happens to concur " with your duty."

He muſt be a ſkilful manufacturer, who can diſtinguiſh the broad cloth of *Junius*, from the woollen homeſpun of *The Whig*. But, our critical ſhopman, who, no doubt, is an excellent judge of various fabricks, is alſo, as SWIFT would ſay, a " *bel-eſprit*, and a woollen-draper." But of this enough!——

It is to be lamented, that, in controverſial writings, the parties ſhould ſo often ſacrifice their judgements

to their prejudices; that they ſhould praiſe without bounds, and condemn without diſcrimination. The diſputants, by praiſing *Junius*, as an *incomparable writer*, thereby called upon others to point out his faults, and to appreciate his merits. On the other hand, the *Philo-Junius's*, who were alarmed for the fame of their favourite, when they heard M'Aulay-Boyd named, as that *incomparable writer*, tried, by every artifice, to detract from his genuine qualities. When it was ſaid, that he was a poet, in addition to his other accompliſhments, as a writer, his detractors exclaimed, *What a Poet!* I do not ſuppoſe, that his fondeſt admirers preſumed to think, at the time, of Spenſer, Shakſpeare, or Milton, of Dryden, Pope, or of Gray. They only meant to ſay, that he wrote *pretty poetry*. I will ſubmit to the diſpaſſionate reader, three copies of unpubliſhed verſes, which were, certainly, written by Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd, and were, kindly, tranſmitted to me, by my very communicative friend, at Dublin.

I. STANZAS, "on ſeeing STERNE'S Grave, unhonoured, in the cemetery of St. George's, Hanover-ſquare:" *(y)*.

"And, is no friendly mourner near!
The laſt ſad office to aſſume;
O'er his cold grave to drop a tear,
Or, "pluck the nettle from his tomb."

Forgive

(y) The rev. Lawrence Sterne, A M. died on the 18th of March 1768 [Scot's Mag. 1768, p. 223] and was buried four days

Forgive me, STERNE, if from thy line,
The ſympathetick hint I drew;
The feeling heart muſt copy thine;
The tender mourner think like you."

II. An IMPROMPTU, upon loſing a game at cheſs, to Serjeant Adair, who allowed, that it was occaſioned by two ladies looking over the chefs-board:—

1.

" 'Tis true, I've loſt a game at cheſs;
But, as things ſtood, no ſhame, or wonder;
Reminded now, you muſt confeſs,
I gain'd a loſs,—without a blunder:

2.

For, while your thoughts were fix'd on board,
Mine were with fleſh and blood delighted;
Which, while on ſenſeleſs queens you por'd,
Better, by far, my thoughts requited.

3.

And, while baſe biſhops, wooden kings,
All your ſoul mov'd, to make attacks on;
My happier fancy ſpread its wings,
And ſoar'd up to Adair, and Jackſon.

4. And

days after, in the new burying-ground, belonging to St. George's, Hanover-ſquare; as the pariſh regiſter ſhows. His death, which had been long expected, was not much noticed, by our poets. He was, at firſt, diſpraiſed: He was, thereupon, defended by ſome verſes [Gent. Mag. 1768, p. 191.] Garrick gave him, as an old friend, ſome metrical praiſe. [Biog. Dict.] At the end of eighteen years, a poetic epitaph was inſcribed on his tomb-ſtone. [Gent. Mag. 1786, p. 932.] But, the verſes of M'Aulay-Boyd are far ſuperior to thoſe effuſions, in pathos, elegance, and point.

4.

And ſo, you ſent them up the ſtair,
Where, well you knew, my thoughts would follow,
As ſure, as greyhound after hare,
Or, after Daphne, ſwift Apollo.

5.

Nor make, vain Carle, thy empty boaſt,
Nor vaunt a triumph, ſuch as this is;
Wield you your arms, midſt wooden hoſt,
And leave to mine the *better pieces*."

III. An EPILOGUE to the tragedy of Douglas, when it was acted by the children of his ſiſter, Mrs. Godley: Spoken by Miſs A. Godley, who performed the part of Lady Randolph. When Miſs R. Godley, in the character of Anna, had finiſhed the account of Lady Randolph's death; her ladyſhip, running on the ſtage, ſpoke, as follows: (z)—

" I aſk Miſs Roſey's pardon:—'tis not ſo,
I could not ſure ſo unpolitely go,
Without a curtſie, plunge i'th' " empty air:"
Lord, how it makes a modern widow ſtare!
Our more ſubſtantial, not leſs fatal flights,
Aſpire not to thoſe odious rocky heights;

In

(z) The alluſion, through the firſt part of this epilogue, refers altogether to the death of Lady Randolph, in the laſt ſcene of Douglas; to the *rocky precipice*, from which ſhe plunged headlong into the *empty air*: The ſecond part contains a happy compliment to the maternal virtues of Mrs. Godley; the more happy, as it was amply due to her many accompliſhments.

In pleaſure's lower region we take wing;
Not a dead lord; a living ſlave's the thing.
And though we give ourſelves ſome "empty airs,"
They're not from "rocks"—but boxes above ſtairs.
Such is the modern drama of the time,
A whimſy, tragi-comic pantomime:
Where clowns and changelings act the foremoſt parts,
And where love's plot, alas! is hands,—not hearts:
But hold! ſententious ſatire ill beſeems
A Miſs, though at your ſervice, not in teens:
Far more delighted, ſhe with rapture tells,
With grateful rapture, what around her dwells.
The happy ſcenes, where "love makes duty light;"
Where ſhines, confeſt, Matilda of to-night,
Maternal, ſhines, whilſt in their ſphere of love,
Her little ſatellites around her move.
Bleſt with her bright example, we aſpire,
To catch the ſparks of virtue's ſacred fire;
The thought, that elevates, the hope, that glows,
With lively ſympathy, the heart, that knows,
No other pain, than other's pains create,
No purer joy, than friends participate."

It has been ſtated, as a fact, that Boyd told his wife, "He was poſitive the *Heroic Epiſtle to Sir William* "*Chambers* was written by *Junius*; for the purpoſe "of trying the effect of political ſatire in verſe." *(a)* I have peruſed the four poems, which are ſuppoſed to have been written by *Malcolm M'Gregor*, with a view to this poſition: But, I am not prepared to ſay, that M'Gregor, and M'Aulay, were, and are, one

(a) The preface to *The Indian Obſerver*, xxix.

one and the ſame ſatiriſt. *(b)* If the four ſatires were written by the ſame perſon; if the prefatory date to *The Dean and Squire*, namely, the 1ſt of May 1782, be the true one; this date would ſhow, that M'Aulay-Boyd could not be the author; becauſe he was then in India; an envoy at Ceylon, or a priſoner at Mauritius. *The Heroic Epiſtle*, however, was publiſhed in May 1773: Junius ceaſed to write, in January 1772. I am unable to trace the connection, without ſome other facts, to direct the eye, and to aſſiſt the underſtanding.

On the contrary, this famous epiſtle has been aſſigned to Maſon, the friend of Gray. It is aſſumed, firſt, that he wrote this epiſtle, although it is ſo unlike his other poems; it is aſſumed, ſecondly, that he was the author of *Junius*'s letters; which letters, from his reſidence, in Yorkſhire, he could not eaſily have written, and which, from his character of the king's chaplain, he was not very likely to have written. *(c)* But, I will

(b) The hunters, when beating the covers, for a fox, ſometimes ſtart a badger. In looking for M'Aulay, through *The Foundling Hoſpital for Wit*, I found Mathias. I ſaw, from what ſource this *Purſuer of Literature* had, literally, copied his malignant note about the late Dean Tucker. [Ib. vol. II. p. 37.] I perceived, where he had poached for ſome of his diſſonant rhymes. [Ib. p. 35–136.] I diſcovered, alſo, the origin of his *Chineſe Epiſtle*. [Ib. p. 18.] Mathias, too, would fain try the effect of *political*, and *perſonal* ſatire, in verſe.

(c) He died at Aſhton, on the 5th of April 1797. There is ſome account of him in the Gent. Mag. 1797, p. 359. By a ſearch in the Lord Chamberlain's office, it has been found, that the rev. William Maſon, was appointed chaplain in ordinary to his Majeſty, on the 20th of Auguſt 1757; that he continued one of the king's

I will not, like the inquiſitive poet,

" ——— my thoughts deceive
" With hope of *things impoſſible* to find."

SUCH are the *documents*, which have convinced me, that Hugh M'Aulay-Boyd was the author of Junius's letters. I ſubmit my argument to the public, without the leaſt emotion either of hope, or fear. Should my opinion prevail, I have no reaſon to expect the favour of any party, nor the affection of any man: Should it be oppoſed, I dread nothing, from any writer, whatever may be the anſwers, which, I learn, are in contemplation; becauſe I have been in the habit of writing, what neither has been anſwered,

King's chaplains, till the end of the year 1772: So that he was one of his Majeſty's chaplains, in ordinary, during the whole period, wherein Junius flouriſhed. There is in the European Mag. 1783, p. 410, a print of Maſon, with an account of his life, and writings.

I do not think it at all more probable, that the rev. Philip Roſenhagen, who died in November 1796, was the writer of Junius. He was, ſays the Gent. Mag. 1796, p. 1059, and 1797, p. 249, " formerly of St. John's College, Cambridge, where he " took the degree of A. B. in 1760, gained one of the claſſical " prizes given by the repreſentatives of the univerſity, in 1762, and " took the degree of A. M. in 1763. A report was at one time, " induſtriouſly, circulated, but without any foundation, except to " flatter his vanity, that he was the author of the letters, ſigned " *Junius*." He was the curate of a pariſh, in Eſſex, to which he uſed to go down, on a Saturday night, with *four horſes*. Roſenhagen is ſaid to have been a nephew of Lady Cheſterfield: Lord Cheſterfield, in one of his letters to his ſon, tells him, that he had been aſked " to gain over *parſon* Roſenhagen; but, that he had de- " clined to interfere in ſuch matters."

ed, nor could be anſwered. Experience muſt determine, whether *this argument* can be anſwered. By abuſe, indeed, it may; the abuſe of deſigned miſconception, and purpoſed miſrepreſentation; of perſonal animoſity, or literary malevolence. I have, indeed, ſo little ſolicitude about the fate of my opinion, with regard to the author of Junius's epiſtles, that I would not ſtep acroſs my library, to gain a dozen proſelytes. I am prompted, by this indifference, to avow, that neither will abuſe provoke me to explain, nor any anſwer induce me to reſume a ſubject, which appears to create ſuch antipathies in ſome, and to kindle ſuch inflammation in others, without any adequate cauſe. My argument, I leave with the intelligent, the ingenuous, part of the nation:

> " If this will not ſuffice, it muſt appear,
> " That malice bears down truth."

I was led to this ſubject, as I have already intimated, by mere accident. I formed my opinion upon ſuch proofs, as ſeemed to me to be ſatisfactory. I have been called upon to deliver to the public my *documents*, which I have now done, as briefly, as the nature of a multifarious inveſtigation allowed. In diſcharging this duty, I may preſume to ſay, that I am actuated by as pure a love of truth, as any of thoſe, who have been ſo forward, to boaſt of their own purity of motive, and to impute improper motives to others. I can have no poſſible intereſt in the queſtion, whether Tom Nokes, or John Styles, wrote the ſeditious letters of Junius, thirty years ago. With Mr. Almon, I never had any acquaintance, nor have

now

now any connection: His politics, and mine, were always ſo diſſimilar, that we never had any attractions for each other: Neither can I, with the frankneſs of Mr. H. S. Woodfall, compliment him on his *Political Anecdotes*; a book, which I do not approve, either in its matter, or its manner. Whatever may be the principles of the editor of Boyd's works, I have as little connection with him: I diſapprove of the republication of the *political productions* of M'Aulay-Boyd; becauſe, I conſider them as libellous, in the extreme. Whether this declaration will be regarded, by the *antipuffers*, as within any of the definitions of the *puff*, I cannot *divine*. Certain it is, however, that the public has an intereſt in the expoſing of *myſtery*. The relatives of thoſe reſpectable perſons, who were ſaid to be the writers of *Junius*'s letters, have a right to demand, that his ſeditious pen may be placed in the proper hand. The illuſtrious connections of thoſe, who were maligned by Junius, have a ſimilar claim. But, neither the law, nor the manners of England, ever permit the grave to be ſearched, for objects of puniſhment, whatever may be their guilt. In this country, the relations of *Junius* have nothing to dread: For one, that would hurt, there are thouſands, who would help the widow, and orphans, of the undoubted author. Even I, much as I deteſt the principles, and deſpiſe the practices, of Junius, would protect his relict, if ſhe wanted protection, and would aſſiſt his children, if their promotion were within my power. And, with theſe ſentiments, will I cloſe my argument, about the writer of

Junius.

Junius. I have endeavoured well, I truſt: And I will conclude, with the manly wiſh of Granville:

"Important truths ſtill let my writings hold,
"And moral myſteries with art unfold."

THE

THE POSTSCRIPT.

SINCE the foregoing ſheets were printed, ſeveral documents have been diſcovered, and facts aſcertained, which I beg leave to ſubmit to the inquiſitive reader, in the commodious form of ſuppletory notes:—

In p. 22, it is ſaid, "Edmund Burke relinquiſhed "the penſion, which he owed to his connection with "W. G. Hamilton." When Burke roſe to ſuch an height, as enabled him to influence, he applied to the Iriſh government, for penſions to his poor relations; ſtating, among other motives, his own merit, in "having reſigned his penſion, on the Iriſh eſtabliſh-"ment."

In p. 27; "After ſo many proofs, which carry con-"viction with them, it is unneceſſary to repeat what "Burke ſaid in Parliament, with regard to Junius."

I will here ſubjoin what Junius ſaid, with regard to Burke: The Gentleman, who has written, on this ſubject, ſeveral letters, under the ſignature of VERAX, has told the Public: "I remember frequently con-"verſing with Mr. Boyd about the ſuppoſed author "of Junius's letters; and I told him, that from the "warmth of the writer, and from the pride of the "pen,

" pen, I could not help thinking, but that Mr. Burke " was the author of theſe letters. I remember very " well his reply; "' My good fellow, he might be, "' from the writing, 'tis true, but Mr. Burke was in "' Ireland, when one of the papers was publiſhed."' " That did not appear to me a ſufficient reaſon againſt " it. Mr. Burke's temper exactly correſponded with " the title of Junius.—To have written Junius's let- " ters, there muſt have been a motive and a cauſe for " paſſion, which Mr. Boyd never felt, or never could " have felt, even if he had had the ſame provocation " to it that Mr. Burke had. In ſhort, ſo much am I " convinced, from the temper and conſtitution of " Mr. Burke, that he was the author of Junius's let- " ters, that I could almoſt perſuade myſelf to believe, " that if he did not write them, nobody did *(d)*." From the foregoing documents, it muſt be apparent to every body, except to VERAX, that the purpoſe of Boyd, in acquitting Burke, was merely to give the writer of VERAX a *put-off*. We have already ſeen, that JUNIUS attributed his own letters to Burke, and that he equally retracted his own imputation, when it ſuited his ſeveral deſigns *(e)*. At any rate, the opinion of ſo well-informed a man, as Boyd undoubtedly was, ought to have great weight with VERAX; ſince no other perſon, who has read my *argument*, with attention, can have any doubt, about the real author of JUNIUS's *letters*.

In p. 60: " His mother's father is ſaid to have died, in 1765: But, we are aſſured, that "' the bequeſt of "' his maternal grandfather did not fall to him till

(d) TRUE BRITON, Dec. 20th.

(e) See before, p. 23-5.

"' ſome

"" ſome time after his marriage; and that when he "" got the eſtate, it was ſo incumbered with annui- "" tants, and haraſſed by ſubſequent litigations, as to "" afford him hardly any relief *(f)*."" Time and chance have put into my hands the " *amended anſwer*" of Hugh M'Aulay Boyd to the bill of complaint, which was filed againſt him in the Chancery court of Ireland, under *that name*, by Hugh Boyd, Eſq. at ſome period, ſubſequent to the year 1769. This *anſwer*, which was ſigned by Barry Yelverton, the preſent Lord Chief Baron of the Exchequer in Ireland; and which muſt have been ſworn to by Hugh M'Aulay Boyd, throws compleat light upon that obſcure tranſaction: And, I will, therefore, ſubmit to the reader ſeveral appoſite facts, which I have carefully collected from it.

1. It is expreſsly ſtated, that Hugh Boyd of Ballycaſtle died in 1765, as I have already intimated; after ſettling his eſtates, by will, on his children, and grandchildren, in ſtrict entail, with contingent remainders, and with truſts, and uſes, almoſt without end. His eſtate of *Redbay*, with the lands of Drumachaman, and Drumakit, lying in the pariſh of Laid, within the barony of Glencarin, and county of Antrim, he deviſed to his grandſon, Adam Boyd, and his iſſue male; and in caſe of his death, without iſſue male, he ſettled the ſame eſtate and lands, in the ſame manner, on his grandſon, Hugh M'Aulay, and his iſſue male, on condition, that he and they took the name of Boyd: Truſtees were appointed by the deviſor to manage the eſtate of Adam Boyd, and empowered to raiſe money thereon, for defraying the

(f) Preface to *The Indian Obſerver*, XVI.

charges

charges of his education, and ſettlement in life: And, it was out of theſe truſts, that the ſaid Chancery ſuit aroſe between one of the ſurviving Truſtees and our Hugh M'Aulay Boyd.

2. It is apparent from the *anſwer* above mentioned, which is before me, that the education of Adam Boyd was neglected; that his ſettlement in life was little attended to; that without giving him any notions, or habits, of buſineſs, he was allowed, while he was under age, to ſail, in the beginning of 1768, with a ſmall adventure to Barbadoes, whence he found his way to Philadelphia, where he died, in December 1768, under twenty-one, and without iſſue male. Here, then, are the *contingencies*, which let in our Hugh M'Aulay, and his iſſue male, to the eſtate of Redbay; that is admitted by him, in his anſwer, to be worth about *two hundred and ſixty pounds*, "over and above the "incumbrances, thereon induced by the ſaid Hugh "Boyd, the teſtator." The bill of complaint prayed indemnity, for the ſum of £.400, which was charged to have been raiſed by the Truſtees under the power of the will, for the uſe of the ſaid Adam Boyd. The defences ſet up were, that the ſurplus rents of the eſtate were quite ſufficient to defray the whole charges of any education, or outfit, which Adam Boyd ever received; that, in fact, no money was ever raiſed, for any ſuch uſes; and that the deceaſed infant left affets enow, in the hands of his tenants, to pay all his real debts. How the Chancery ſuit was ultimately determined, I am unable to tell.

3. Soon after the news of Adam Boyd's death arrived in England, Hugh M'Aulay ſet off for Ireland; took poſſeſſion of the eſtate, though he had then only

iſſue

iſſue female; and at the ſame time aſſumed the name of Boyd; as we may ſee, in his verified anſwer to the bill of complaint. It is apparent, from a conſideration of every circumſtance, that theſe events muſt have taken place, during the laſt week of April 1769. Adam Boyd died, as we have ſeen, at Philadelphia, in December 1768; the news of this important death would be immediately tranſmitted by his connections, there, to his truſtees in Ireland; and as ſuch news could not be concealed, Alexander M'Auley, who lived in Antrim, would ſpeedily ſend the intereſting information to his brother Hugh, in London: April 1769 is, therefore, the epoch of the aſſumption of the name of Boyd by our noted author, who, during three months, wrote the famous letters of Junius, while he retained the more democratical, but leſs dignified name, of M'AULEY *(g)*.

In

(g) Junius publiſhed his firſt letter, as I have often ſtated, for the uſes of recollection, on the 21ſt of January 1769. Sir William Draper anſwered him, on the 26th. And during February, and March, Junius was chiefly occupied with this antagoniſt. The ninth, tenth, and eleventh letters of Junius were dated on the 10th, the 21ſt, and 24th of April 1769. His next letter was dated on the 30th of the ſubſequent May. Meanwhile, Sir William Draper publiſhed another letter, which was dated from Clifton, on the 24th of April; and which was not anſwered by Junius, who was generally alert, though Sir William ſpoke contemptuouſly of his "*falſe aſſertions*," and talked diſdainfully of a writer, who "ſtill *ſkulks* in the *dark*, in the *mean ſubterfuge* of a *maſk*." From theſe facts, it is plainly inferible, that the writer of Junius was not in England, when this letter was publiſhed, on the 1ſt of May 1769. This letter appeared in the edition of Junius, publiſhed in 1771, with "the Anecdotes of the Author:" But, it was not republiſhed, in the *genuine edition* of JUNIUS, in 1772. Theſe circumſtances, and

In p. 65: "As his own father did not die opulent, "we may eaſily ſuppoſe, that the ſon was deprived, "in 1766, at once of the benefit of a father's advice, "and of the reſource of a father's purſe." In confirmation of theſe ſentiments, I will here ſubjoin, for the reader's ſatisfaction, an atteſted copy of the laſt will of Alexander M'Auley, who died, as we have ſeen [before, p. 53], on the 13th of July 1766:

"IN the name of God, Amen. I, Alexander "M'Auley, of the city of Dublin, eſquire, Do make "this my laſt will and teſtament, in manner following: "I deviſe all my real eſtate to my kinſman James "Stewart, of Coleraine, eſquire, my ſon-in-law John "Godley, eſquire, and my eldeſt ſon Alexander "M'Auley, Upon Truſt, that they, or the ſurvivors "or ſurvivor of them, or the heirs of ſuch ſurvivor, "ſhall ſell a competent part thereof, in aid of my per-"ſonal eſtate, for payment of all my debts, of what "kind ſoever, and funeral expences; and out of what "ſhall remain unſold to pay a yearly rent charge of "forty pounds to my dearly beloved wife, for her life, "in addition to her jointure; and a yearly rent charge "of one hundred pounds to my younger ſon Hugh "M'Auley,

thoſe dates, caſt a vivid light on the conduct of M'Auley, after he was informed of the contingencies, which gave him, as a remainder-man, an eſtate; and ſhow diſtinctly, that he ſet out from London, immediately, *after* the 24th of April, and returned from Ireland, immediately, *before* the 30th of May 1769. His letter to the Duke of Grafton, of this date, appears, from its whole context, as if the author of it had *reſumed* a *ſubject*, which he had *for ſome time forgotten*. Upon the whole, I ſubmit this long note to the reader, as a ſtrong link of the extended chain of circumſtantial evidence, which has been accurately arranged, for proving, that M'Auley-Boyd was the writer of Junius's Letters.

" M'Auley, for his life; the ſaid ſeveral rent charges " to be paid by equal half-yearly payments, upon " every firſt day of May and firſt day of November, " the firſt payment to be made on ſuch of the ſaid " days as ſhall happen next after my death, and to be " recovered by diſtreſs; the ſaid yearly rent charge of " one hundred pounds to be unto my ſaid ſon Hugh, " in lieu and full ſatisfaction of and for all claims and " demands whatſoever, which he can or may have upon " my aſſets or effects: The ſaid Truſtees to ſtand ſeiſed " of what ſhall remain unſold of my real eſtate (ſub- " ject to the ſaid ſeveral rent charges), In Truſt, for " my ſaid eldeſt ſon Alexander, his heirs and aſſigns. " In Witneſs whereof I have hereunto, and to a du- " plicate hereof, ſubſcribed my name, and affixed my " ſeal, this 23d day of December 1763.

Seal. " ALEXANDER M'AULEY."

Adminiſtration of the goods, &c. of Alexander M'Auley, with the above will annexed, was granted to Alexander M'Auley, his natural, and lawful, ſon, on the 23d of May 1767.

It is a fact, which I will mention, on the authority of a very intelligent friend of Boyd, in addition to all experience, as to the kindly affections of the female ſex, that when the inattention, and imprudence, of Boyd had involved him in the moſt complicated embarraſſments, his mother came from Dublin to London, in order to ſee how ſhe could relieve him from his inextricable difficulties.*

* This excellent woman died in 1782, or 1783.

In p. 60: "Hugh M'Auley-Boyd was now to "maintain a wife and family, as well as he could, by "whatever means." His means may be thus eſtimated:

	£.	s.	d.
From the will of his father, half-yearly, on the 1ſt of May, and the 1ſt of November - - -	100	0	0
From the eſtate of Redbay, after his ſucceſſion, as the remainder-man, in April 1769 - - - -	260	0	0
From his wife's income - - - - - - - - - -	300	0	0
The total of his yearly income, which was probably ill paid	£. 660	0	0

But, in the courſe of his extreme embarraſſments, before he went to India, he had ſettled on the Redbay eſtates ſo many annuities, as to exhauſt the whole annual income; and he had prevailed on his wife to diſpoſe of one hundred pounds of her annuity.

Inſtead of making a fortune in India, M'Auley Boyd was ſuppoſed, by intelligent men at Madras, to have died in debt ſixty-two thouſand ſtar pagodas, or £.24,800 ſterling.

In p. 63: "M'Auley Boyd returned, with his fa- "mily, to London, probably, in 1775." I have ſince been informed that, about the year 1776, he rented that commodious houſe, on the Eaſt ſide of Norfolk-ſtreet, in the Strand, next the river; that Mr. Cobb, who was then an eminent upholſterer, in St. Martin's lane, furniſhed the houſe for him; that as the value of the furniture was not paid, at the appointed time, Mr. Cobb obtained of Mr. Boyd a bond and judgement, for the debt, amounting to £.370; that for this ſum Mr. Cobb, being ſtill unſatisfied, entered up the judgement, and in autumn 1778 laid his execution on the goods, in the houſe of Mr. Boyd; that, owing

to

to the miſconduct of the attorney, the ſheriff's officer remained in the houſe for ſeveral months, during which time, Mr. Cobb was obliged to pay the rent of the houſe; that, in the end, Mr. Boyd's man-ſervant purchaſed the furniture, which was ſtill in the poſſeſſion of the ſheriff's officer; when Mr. Cobb, after much delay, trouble, and charge, obtained his debt. All the beforementioned facts, I was told by the very perſon, who was employed by Mr. Cobb to put the furniture into Mr. Boyd's houſe; and who added, that, after ſeeing Mr. Boyd frequently, he appeared to him to be a very intelligent, civil, fair-ſpeaking man; but, that he never could find out, who he was, or by what means he lived, only that he had married a Weſt-India lady, with a fortune. Thus much from this intelligent and communicative perſon, who is now himſelf an eminent upholſterer.

The fact is, that this tranſaction was afterwards brought into Weſtminſter-hall, where it is remembered, as *Boyd's Caſe*, though the lawyers themſelves, as they do not clearly recollect the facts, do not diſtinctly underſtand the caſe; for, it was firſt mentioned to me, as the caſe of a *diſtreſs for rent*, which it could not well be. From one of *the briefs*, in the cauſe, which brief accident has brought into my hands, I will ſtate *the facts*, for the information of the lawyers. In 1778, and for ſome years before, there lived with Mr. Boyd a man ſervant, named John Percy, and a woman ſervant, his wife, who from many ſavings, in a courſe of years, had accumulated money enough to buy £. 400, Eaſt-India 3 per cent. annuities; and who, ſeeing an execution ſo long in the houſe, were perſuaded by Mr. Boyd to ſell out their India annuities, to pay off

the debt, and to take the goods, at their appraiſed value, in the hands of the ſheriff's officer. In this manner, was the execution of Mr. Cobb ſatisfied; and, thereupon, Percy rented the goods to his maſter, at an yearly ſum of £.30. In the ſubſequent year, 1779, another execution was laid upon the ſame goods, in the ſame place, at the ſuit of one Mr. Workman, who had obtained a bill for £.50 of a third perſon, which bill Mr. Boyd had indorſed, *to accommodate a friend*. Percy, with the aſſiſtance of thoſe, who ſaw and pitied his ſituation, ſatisfied this ſecond execution; and he was thereupon adviſed to bring an action againſt the ſheriffs Pugh and Wright, in the court of Exchequer, for the recovering back of what he had thus been obliged to pay wrongfully. This action of Percy *v.* Pugh and Wright was tried, on Monday, the 12th of June 1780, at Weſtminſter-hall, before the Lord Chief Baron Skinner, who, in ſumming up the evidence to the jury, informed them, that there did not ariſe in the cauſe any other queſtion of law, but whether the tranſaction were *bonâ fide*, or *colourable*; which, it was for them to determine, from the evidence. The facts, which have been ſtated, were ſo clearly made out in proof, that the jury did not heſitate to find for the plaintiff. The records of Weſtminſter-hall furniſh the moſt indubitable proofs, year after year, of the incorrigible inattention, and endleſs embarraſſments, of M'Auley Boyd.

I will only add to this ſingular caſe, which ſhows at once the diſtreſs, and the imprudence, of Mr. Boyd, that when he departed, in the ſubſequent year, for Madras, Percy ſold his books to John Townſon, the late India Director, for about £.70; an inconſiderable ſum, which

which proves what has been already intimated, that Mr. Boyd did not enjoy the benefit of a library.

In p. 70: "How he was particularly employed in "1777, and 1778, I am unable to tell." How he was buſily employed, in that period of his various occupations, I have ſince learned from ſubſequent inquiries. "When Lauchlan M'Leane, ſays VERAX *(h)*, "came over from the Nabob of Arcot, to ſerve his intereſt "in the India-houſe, Mr. Stewart introduced him to "Boyd. They dined together at the Shakſpeare ta-"vern; and *I* was of the party till one in the morn-"ing, when they went upon buſineſs; and *I* de-"parted. They ſat together the whole night; and "Mr. Boyd was retained to write in favour of the "Nabob's caſe, and publiſhed a pamphlet; and wrote "in ſupport of it in the Gazetteer." The fact, however, is, that Boyd became early acquainted with his countryman M'Leane; and, it is in evidence, that Boyd wrote in ſupport of the Nabob's pretenſions, in the *Public Advertiſer*. He did much more for the Nabob. Every one muſt remember what debates enſued, at the India-houſe, when news arrived of the revolution at Madras, which was occaſioned by the arreſt of Lord Pigot, in purſuance of orders from the majority of the Council. At a Court of Proprietors, on the 7th of May 1777, a motion was made by Sir Herbert Mackworth to recal Lord Pigot, together with the whole council; "in order to have their "reſpective conduct more effectually inquired into." Whereupon, "Mr. BOYD, Mr. Redhead, and Mr. "MAC LEANE, alleged, that Mr. Rous had, with-

(h) True Briton, 19th Dec. 1799.

" out any foundation, made the Nabob a party in the " queſtion *(i)*." But, was this our Hugh Boyd? Yes: The fact may be proved by record evidence, that, on the 22d of April 1777, £. 500 India ſtock were transferred to Hugh Boyd, Eſq. of Norfolk-ſtreet, in the Strand, by John Dawes; and was re-transferred, in May, and July, of the ſame year, after M'Leane had ſailed for India.

Boyd not only ſpoke, but wrote, for the Nabob, in the newspapers, and in pamphlets. During March 1777, the Directors of the India Company appear to have been greatly affected by theſe publications: And, they publiſhed, in the London Gazette of the 29th of March, an advertiſement againſt two pamphlets; becauſe " they conceived the abuſe therein to be un-" paralleled, the deſign to be extremely dangerous, " and the object of the author to be the depreciation " of the Company." This notice was immediately encountered by an advertiſement from Lauchlan M'Leane, the Nabob's agent, who avowed the two reprobated pamphlets; " having furniſhed all the materials of which they are compoſed:" And, he undertook to defend them, at the hazard of his *fame (k)*.

From

(i) Scots Mag. 1777, p. 267.

(k) See the whole proceedings, in the Scots Magazine, 1777, p. 219-20. The two pamphlets, which were thus complained of as *abuſive*, *inſidious*, and *dangerous*, were entitled; 1. " Letter from " Mahomed Ali Chan, Nabob of Arcot, to the Court of Directors:" 2. " Original Papers relative to Tanjore." After a careful examination of theſe two Tracts, I think, that they were both written by M'Auley Boyd, from the documents, which had been furniſhed by M'Leane. The *ſtate of facts*, which was annexed to this Letter, was plainly drawn by the vigorous, but inaccurate, hand of

From the difficult taſk of defending the pretenſions of the Nabob, it required little of the dexterity of Boyd to engage in the ſtill harder taſk of vindicating the conduct of the four counſellors, Stratton, Brooke, Floyer, and Mackay, who had overturned the adminiſtration of Lord Pigot. He ſcribbled for them, chiefly, in the news-papers; and, they in return gave, and lent, him money. In purſuance of an addreſs

Boyd. The *Introduction* to *the Tanjore papers* is ſtill more obviouſly the elegant, and energetic, work of Boyd. The following paſſage is copied almoſt verbatim from his *Antrim Letters:* "Tyranny, "cruelty, oppreſſion, laid waſte the country without; riot, de-"bauchery, and every ſpecies of vice, reigned within the palace." [p. xiii.] This tract, conſiſting of 134 pages, was ſold, on the 12th of December 1796, by Leigh and Sotheby, at the ſale of W. Gerard Hamilton's books, for *two pence.* The Letter from the Nabob was ſold, at the ſame time, for the ſame price. Neither of theſe pamphlets ſeem to have been read by W. G. Hamilton; as the ſheets, whereof they conſiſted, had not been cut open, when they came to my hands. There was another pamphlet, which appeared, at the ſame time, from the ſame ſource, entitled, "Ori-"ginal Papers, tranſmitted by the Nabob of Arcot to Great Bri-"tain;" and which was obviouſly the compilation of *Boyd,* from the inſtructions of *M'Leane.*

The *authenticity* of thoſe pamphlets, M'Leane, the well-known agent of the Nabob, undertook by public advertiſement to aſſert, under the penalty "of having his *name conſigned* to *diſgrace* and *in-"famy.*" M'Leane did not live to pay the forfeiture of *his name:* For, he ſailed for India, in 1777, and was heard of never more.

The taſk of confuting the conjoint pamphlets of M'Leane, and Boyd, was aſſigned by the India Directors to Mr. George Rous, under the ſuperintendance of a Committee. After a while, he produced three huge, quarto, volumes of ſuch curious, and authentic, documents, as to reduce the value of the ſaid pamphlets to *two-pence,* a-piece: He entered, indeed, into no reciprocation of ſmartneſs: But, ſuch is the difference between *truth,* however ſimple, and *declamation,* however ſplendid!

from

from the Houſe of Commons, the four Counſellors were tried, for the before-mentioned miſdemeanour, in the court of King's Bench, on the 20th of December 1779: And, being found guilty, though the evidence did not ſupport the inference, which was drawn by the information, they were each of them ſentenced to pay a thouſand pounds *(l)*. Poor Boyd being in the end hunted, by the terriers of the law, from his houſe in Norfolk-ſtreet, found a covert in the obſcurity of Chedley-court, Pall-mall; whence he eſcaped, on a Sunday morning, to Ireland, on his courſe to India, in January 1781 *(m)*. It thus appears, notwithſtanding what has been already intimated [before, p.72], that M'Auley-Boyd, whom we have ſeen ſpeaking, and writing, as an inſtrument in M'Leane's hands, for the Nabob, and ſcribbling, as an apologiſt, for his friends, the counſellors, had not to begin *the ſtudy of Oriental politicks*, when he arrived, after all his dangers, at Madras.

In

(l) An. Reg. 1779, p. 316: Scots Mag. 1780, p. 102–3.

(m) From ſome documents, which have fallen into my hands, I obſerve, that one of the counſellors before mentioned, ſhabbily reclaimed, of the unhappy Boyd, a debt of an hundred pounds, which had been originally ſecured on a note of hand, whereon proceſs iſſued in May 1780; and which debt was finally ſettled by a bond, dated the 2d of January 1781. He ſet off for India, immediately after this date; being kindly accommodated by an unalterable friend with £.700, which Boyd never repaid. Boyd arrived at Madras rather *late*, than *early*, in 1781. But, he never acted as ſecretary, or aſſiſtant ſecretary, to Lord Macartney, who merely gave him his protection. One of his firſt mortifications, and hindrances, aroſe from the diſadvantageous circumſtance, that he was not a ſervant of the Company: When he was appointed joint harbour-maſter of Madras with Mr. Corbit, and was named firſt in

In p. 55: "He certainly acquitted himſelf with credit at Trinity college; and had a memory of ſingular ſtrength."—While he ſtill remained at the univerſity, he diſcovered a very uncommon faculty of carrying on multiplication to a great extent, at leaſt, to the length of multiplying nine figures by nine, with the help of his memory, alone. An intelligent friend, who was intimately acquainted with M'Auley Boyd,

the commiſſion, his co-partner inſiſted ſo ſtrenuouſly on his right, as a ſervant of the Company, that the writings were tranſcribed, and the name of Corbit was inſerted before the name of Boyd.

This imprudent man was not in the leaſt changed either in his habits, or his practices, by his change of ſituation: He learned nothing in the ſchool of adverſity: The mind of Boyd ſcorned the leſſons of experience. He became ſenſible, however, at the ſad moment, "when round his death-bed every friend ſhould run," that *ſome friends had abandoned him.* [Life of Boyd, prefixed to the Ind. Obſerver, p. 22.] No wonder! A thouſand weakneſſes, and peccadilloes, are forgiven in young men, which cannot be endured in a man of forty. A tranſaction happened about that time, which probably brought poor Boyd, with ſorrow, to an untimely grave: Capt. Lloyd, of the Manſhip Indiaman, ſold to Boyd a ſmall cargo of printing types, paper, and other articles of ſtationary; and finding it almoſt impoſſible to obtain payment, he diſcovered with his uſual activity, and acuteneſs, that Boyd had ſold the ſame paper to a third perſon, for a leſs value than he had bought it: Upon this diſcovery, Lloyd told Boyd, that if he did not immediately pay him the price of his goods, he would cauſe him to be carried into the *criminal* court of Madras: The debt was thereupon paid. Within the ample extent of our biography, there is not a character, which ſo completely reſembles that of Boyd, as the accurate delineation of Savage's life, which Johnſon finiſhed, with theſe appoſite reflections: "Let thoſe who, in confidence of ſuperior capacities, or attainments, diſregard the common maxims of life, be "reminded, that nothing will ſupply the want of prudence; and "that negligence and irregularity, long continued, will make "knowledge uſeleſs, wit ridiculous, and genius contemptible."

from

from 1766 to 1781, has assured me that, as he knew this remarkable anecdote of him, he laid a wager of a rump and dozen, that he would procure a person, who would multiply nine digits by nine, from the efforts of his memory, alone; that he thereupon spoke to Boyd, who readily undertook to perform this singular operation, in arithmetic, which he knew he could do with ease; that the parties met, for this purpose, at seven o'clock in the morning, in the house of the gentleman, who laid the wager; and that Boyd having performed the task by memory, while the same gentleman made the same calculation with his pen, won the wager. My intelligent friend also informed me, that Boyd appeared to him to derive some help from his fingers *(n)*.

In p. 58: "M'Auley Boyd became acquainted with "many members of the *Literary Club*." It is moreover true, as VERAX has indeed intimated, that M'Auley Boyd was a member of the *Anonymous* Club, at the Globe tavern, in Fleet-street, wherein he often spoke: But, his style of oratory was not brilliant: As a speaker, he was, like his father, slow, and sometimes tedious; yet, was he always intelligent, and *figurative*.

As a writer, he had more *facility*: But, as I was told by the same intelligent friend, who knew M'Auley Boyd most thoroughly, he seldom, or never wrote,

(n) VERAX, I observe, has remarked, "that Boyd could mul-"tiply *five* figures by *five*, and give the sum total, in the dark." [TRUE BRITON.] The fact is, as I have stated, that M'Auley first showed, at Trinity college, this uncommon faculty, which enabled him to carry on the multiplication to *nine figures*. This performance evinced a great strength of memory and steadiness of head.

in

in the day-time, ſuch were his habits of diſſipation; he choſe the night, for his lucubrations, after every body had retired to reſt, from one to three o'clock, in the morning. This *trait* accounts ſufficiently for the inaccuracies, which abound in all his writings, and in his JUNIUS, particularly.

It is a fact, which all who knew Boyd recollect clearly, that his command of temper was ſuch, he could not be agitated into paſſion, though he could, and often did, make other perſons angry by his own coolneſs. This is another trait of character, which gave him a manifeſt ſuperiority over his antagoniſts, both in his JUNIUS, and in his other controverſial writings.

In p. 92: "I have impartial evidence to prove, that "M'Auley Boyd was forward to ſhow an intereſt about "the letters of JUNIUS."—The ſame intelligent friend has alſo aſſured me, that M'Auley Boyd *uſed to carry* JUNIUS, *in his pockct*; and would ſometimes *ſpout* the more brilliant paſſages in his favourite author.

In December 1777, Boyd made another viſit to Ireland, and reſided with his mother in Mary-ſtreet, Dublin.

In 1779, he publiſhed "Genuine Abſtracts from "Two Speeches of the late Earl of Chatham, with "ſome Introductory Obſervations, and Notes." In theſe *Introductory Obſervations*, may be ſeen the ſame ſentiments, and language, as an attentive reader would perceive in his *Antrim Letters*, and in his *Junius*. Some of the *ſame ſentiments*, I have ſeen in his *private letters*.

A RECA-

A RECAPITULATION *of the* ARGUMENT.

IN all caſes, wherein the proof is to ariſe from a variety of circumſtances, a *recapitulation* is often neceſſary, and always uſeful, for bringing together the diſtant circumſtances, and for drawing the fair inferences from the previous premiſes.

1. The artifices of *the writer* of JUNIUS, and the intereſt of his publiſhers, have, at all times. attributed the writing of theſe letters to a variety of men, as it ſuited their ſeveral deſigns, on ſucceſſive occaſions: it therefore became neceſſary to ſhew, by a particular examination, that none of the perſons, who had thus been mentioned by artifice, and maligned by intereſt, as the authors of Junius's letters, were the writers of epiſtles, which are oftener mentioned, than perfectly underſtood. It is apparent, that the allegations on theſe ſeveral heads of imputation muſt neceſſarily deſtroy each other, as the *antidote* counteracts *poiſon*. There are intelligent perſons, who even now perſuade themſelves, that either Edmund Burke, or W. Gerard Hamilton, wrote thoſe letters: Yet both thoſe perſons rejected the imputation, at times, when they could not be ſuſpected of fallacy *(a)*. What inference can be drawn from the commpariſon of their public writings, or private epiſtles, when tried by the ſatisfactory proofs, which ariſe from the accurate collation of M'Auley

(a) See p. 5—44.

Boyd's

Boyd's productions, ſupported as ſuch collations are by a thouſand collateral circumſtances!

2. In order to narrow the queſtion, I have ſhown, that the letters of JUNIUS were written neither by an Engliſh, nor by a Scottiſh, author; but by a native of Ireland *(b)*. I have proved, that Hugh M'Auley was born and educated at Dublin.

3. That the letters of Junius were written by an inexperienced, or a juvenile pen, I have proved beyond contradiction *(c)*. As Hugh Boyd was born in April 1746,

(b) See the proofs of this poſition in the note (m) p. 84: Add to theſe, that the father of Hugh M'Auley uſes, in *his will* [p. 130.] the word *Younger*, in the ſame anomalous ſenſe, as his ſon uſed *Elder* for *Eldeſt*.

(c) See p. 85—8: Let me add, that uncommon genius, and premature talents, were not produced, only, at Dublin, and Briſtol, during that period: Edinburgh gave to Dr. M'Kenzie a ſon of conſiderable genius and forward talents, who died under age in 1780. See the eulogium by Mr. Profeſſor Dalzel, on James M'Kenzie: "At the age of *twelve* his converſation was ſuch as to "afford very high pleaſure, and even inſtruction to perſons ad-"vanced in life." [Scots Mag. 1780, p. 180.] And ſee ſpecimens of his poetry, at the age of *twelve*, and of *ſixteen*. [Ib. 209—10.] Dr. Beattie, of Aberdeen, had once a ſon, alas! who was, by the recommendation of the Mareſhal College, appointed a Profeſſor at the age of *nineteen*, and died in 1790, when he had paſſed twenty-two. Both M'Kenzie, and Beattie, were not more remarkable for genius, than for their moral qualities: In this laſt reſpect, they were far ſuperior to Chatterton, and M'Auley Boyd. Beattie was equal to Chatterton for his intuitive knowledge of life: and he was ſuperior to Boyd, in erudition, and in the qualities of a poet; yet, whether he could have produced ſuch political papers as Boyd's, I am unable to decide: Had Beattie been turned out on the wilds of the world, to ſeek for ſubſiſtence, amidſt the competitions of life, he certainly could have written political lucubrations, both in proſe and verſe, with great acumen, and aſperity. [See the inſtructive life of James Hay Beattie A. M. by Dr. Beattie.] His Majeſty's

1746, and began to write *Junius's* epiſtles in January 1769, theſe epiſtles were written by him in the twenty-third, the twenty-fourth, and the twenty-fifth years of his age: He wrote them, in the midſt of *diſſipation*, "While nature and nature's works lay hid in night."

4. The letters of Junius were publiſhed by a perſon, who delighted *to fiſh in troubled* waters. So M'Auley Boyd,

> "A ſoldier now, he with his coat appears,
> "A *fiſher now*, his trembling angle bears *(d)*."

5. The writer of Junius was a frequent attendant in both houſes of Parliament, who often quotes ſcraps of parliamentary ſpeeches, as taken by himſelf *(e)*. This trait diſtinguiſhed M'Auley Boyd above all others.

6. By comparing JUNIUS with the other witings of M'Auley Boyd, we ſee the ſame characteriſticks in all: the ſame elegance and energy; the ſame inaccuracy and inexperience; the ſame topicks, and imagery, and expreſſions; the ſame turbulence; and, even *in his Obſerver*, may be traced

> "The cockle of rebellion, inſolence, ſedition *(f)*."

7. It

Majeſty's reign has been, indeed, very fruitful in premature talents: the King's Miniſter diſplayed all the reſplendent powers of a great Orator, and profound Stateſman, at the early age of twenty-two.

(a) See p. 88, and the Gen. Edit. of Junius, Pref. xviii.

(e) See p. 83—4.

(f) See p. 88—9—90; and ſee particularly the note (s) in p. 66: Unleſs this note can be either anſwered, or explained away, my poſition muſt be admitted, as incontrovertible: For, 1ſt, it is an undoubted fact, that M'Auley Boyd wrote *the letters* to the Antrim Freeholders, with peculiar references to JUNIUS; 2dly, we ſee tranſplanted from the one to the other, the ſame *expreſſions*, the ſame *artifices*, the ſame topicks, the ſame *flowers*, and the ſame policy; 3dly,

7. It is alſo a peculiar characteriſtic of M'Auley-Boyd, that he took a *particular intereſt* in Junius; he carried Junius in his pocket; he ſpouted paſſages from Junius; and, as if he knew the writer, he talked with confidence, that the author never would be diſcovered *(g)*.

8. The wife of M'Auley-Boyd *often ſuſpected* him of being the author of JUNIUS, and the family of M'Auley-Boyd, in Ireland, have *long had an habitual notion among them, that he was the writer of that famous paper (h)*.

9. M'Auley-Boyd never diſclaimed the imputation of being the author, like Edmund Burke, W. G. Hamilton, Lord Sackville, and others. He never claimed the honour of writing Junius's letters: If he had, it would now be ſaid, that his vanity claimed what his talents could not execute: But as *deeds* ſpeak more perſuaſively than *words*, he did that, on ſeveral occaſions, which is more ſatisfactory in its inferences: He virtually acknowledged, by his actions, which he did not voluntarily perform, that he was the author of writings, which he had early determined never to avow: "The *deeds* themſelves, though *mute*, ſpoke loud the *doer*" *(i)*.

3dly, as it is a known fact, that he was preſent at Belfaſt, while the Antrim Letters were written, he muſt be acknowledged to be the thief, who ſtole, with a dexterous hand, the glittering counters of Junius, to bribe his fellow freeholders.

(g) See p. 92—93.

(h) Id.

(i) See page 90-1: He had private, as well as public, motives for not acknowledging himſelf to be the author of *Junius's* Epiſtles: He knew, that his private character could not bear inſpection: Add to theſe intimations, that the morality of *Junius* and of M'Auley-Boyd are exactly the ſame.

10. Such are the *affirmative proofs:* We are thus brought to the objections, which are oppoſed to my inferences, and which conſiſt, chiefly, of the aſſumptions of ſophiſtry. It is an aſſumption to ſuppoſe, that the writer of Junius was ſome great perſonage, ſome great politician, ſome great lawyer, ſome great ſcholar. *(k)*. It is an aſſumption to argue, that there is in Junius either ſuperior information, or ſuperior knowledge, or any thing either in the matter, or manner, beyond the powers of M'Auley-Boyd to produce *(l)*.

11. In order to meet ſuch aſſumptions; I have ſhown where, and how, M'Auley-Boyd was educated: In order to account for his *imagery*, I have proved, that while he was a boy, at ſchool, his *proſe* exerciſes were too *poetical* to pleaſe his father *(m)*.

12. With the deſign to ſhew what he could write, I have produced what he did write; conſiſting of various ſpecimens of M'Auley-Boyd's writings, in proſe, and verſe; and I have contraſted his political papers,

(k). See p. 3—5—44—46.

(l). See p. 45—8: Add to the proofs therein given, the writer's notes to his *Genuine Edition* of Junius, in which the inquiſitive reader will ſee the ſort of books, which he quotes, and quotes like a lawyer:—The *Hiſtory of the Minority*. [Gen. Ed. vol. 1. p. 78.] De lolme on the Conſtitution. [Pref.] Monteſquieu [Ib. 52.] The *Caſe of the Middleſex Election*. [Ib. 45.] Blackſtone's Commentaries. [Ib. 161.] Pope's Letters. [Ib. 185.] Torcy's Memoirs. [Ib. 197.] Ben Johnſon. [Vol. II. p. 96.] Doctor Muſgrave's *Examination*. [Ib. 99.] Letter on Libels. [Ib. 20.] Coke, 2 Inſt. [Ib. 123.] Hawkins. [Ib. 165.] Congreve's *Double Dealer*. [Ib. 210.] 4 Inſt. 2 Hale, P. C. The Statutes. [Ib. 320—1.] State Tr. [Ib. 323.] Seldeh by N. Bacon 182, [Ib. 327.] Parliamentary Hiſtory. [Id.] Such was the library of JUNIUS!!!

(m.) See before p. 53—4.

which were ſucceſſively publiſhed, under different ſignatures, on the ſame anarchical principle; having the ſame topicks and energies, the ſame faults and beauties: On this head, I have ſhown, by contraſt, that the defects and excellencies, the affectations of imagery, and the peculiarities of ſpirit, in his *Junius* and in his *Obſerver*, are the ſame *(n)*, though they were certainly written with diſſimilar aims.

13. For the purpoſe of letting in the evidence of the writer's widow, I have exhibited the record of their marriage; which record, when coupled with other proofs, precludes the fatal objection of an *alibi*, and prevents the leſs formidable remark of the improbability that, in his circumſtances, he would marry at ſo early an age.

14. Laſtly: I have not either ſeen in the public controverſy, or heard in private converſation, any other objections, than doubts and heſitations, ſophiſms and fictions, which, when oppoſed to affirmative proofs, muſt appear to be of ſo airy and light a quality, that they are but the ſhadows of a ſhadow: Conſidering, then, that there are ſatisfactory evidence for the affirmative poſition, and no evidence for the negative, I muſt be allowed to conclude, with TILLOTSON, that "thoſe things are *certain* among men, which cannot "be denied without obſtinacy and folly."

(n.) See before p. 66—96—99—109—111—112—116—119.

F I N I S.

Printed by Luke Hanſard, Great Turnſtile, Lincoln's-Inn Fields.

D.r Sr.

Holy Lead, Saturday Dec.r 6th 1777

Here I am;— & I much fear, likely to be for a day or two longer. — For the Wind is most ill-naturedly in the teeth of the Harbour. But it is to be hoped, it will not be inexorable;— & that it will soon veer about for us:— I wish Æolus were a Patriot; & there might be then speedy hopes of his turning:— you know I mean only the Court Patriots;— the eye-balls Ornaments of the Treasury Bench &c —:— & not on the side of the House where S.r G. S. sits.

Yr. very sincere
Hugh Boyd

A fac simile of the usual hand writing of HUGH BOYD.

Gardon sculpt. 30 Pall Mall

DA
508
.B6
C7
1800
c.1
B.b F.d

1737864

11833

2238

G